

STATE PERFORMANCE PLAN / ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT: PART B

for STATE FORMULA GRANT PROGRAMS under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act

**For reporting on
FFY 2020**

Missouri



PART B DUE February 1, 2022

**U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
WASHINGTON, DC 20202**

Introduction

Instructions

Provide sufficient detail to ensure that the Secretary and the public are informed of and understand the State's systems designed to drive improved results for students with disabilities and to ensure that the State Educational Agency (SEA) and Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) meet the requirements of IDEA Part B. This introduction must include descriptions of the State's General Supervision System, Technical Assistance System, Professional Development System, Stakeholder Involvement, and Reporting to the Public.

Intro - Indicator Data

Executive Summary

Additional information related to data collection and reporting

Number of Districts in your State/Territory during reporting year

560

General Supervision System:

The systems that are in place to ensure that IDEA Part B requirements are met, e.g., monitoring, dispute resolution, etc.

GENERAL SUPERVISION IN MISSOURI

Under federal statute and regulations, each state has a responsibility to have a system of general supervision that monitors the implementation of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) by local education agencies (LEAs). The system must be accountable for enforcing the requirements of the IDEA and for ensuring continuous improvement in outcomes for students with disabilities. The general supervision system in Missouri is the responsibility of the Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE) Office of Special Education (OSE) and is comprised of the following eight components:

1. State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)/State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP)
2. Policies/procedures/effective implementation
3. Integrated monitoring activities
4. Fiscal management
5. Data on process and results
6. Improvement/correction/incentives/sanctions
7. Effective dispute resolution
8. Targeted technical assistance and professional development

INTEGRATED MONITORING ACTIVITIES

DESE implements a three-year cohort cycle for monitoring all federal programs, including special education, through a tiered monitoring process in an effort to fulfill state and federal monitoring requirements for both programmatic and fiscal components. The objectives of the tiered monitoring process include:

- Monitor each LEA in a three-year cycle
- Increase the number of LEAs meeting and maintaining compliance
- Establish processes to target technical assistance and training needs

LEAs are divided into three cohorts which cycle through the monitoring activities described below. Each cohort is comprised of just under 200 LEAs.

Year One - LEA Self-Assessment and DESE Desk Review Verification:

- Self-assessment training is provided by OSE to LEA staff, and resources are posted on DESE's website
- LEAs use the Improvement Monitoring, Accountability and Compliance System (IMACS), a web-based general supervision management system, to conduct a self-assessment file review and submit data measuring the timely completion of initial evaluations and transition of children from Part C to Part B
- OSE staff verify the LEA-submitted data through a desk review

Year Two - Corrective Action Plan (CAP):

- OSE notifies LEAs of the results of the self-assessment and desk review verification
- OSE provides CAP/Self-Assessment Year Two training and posts resources on the DESE website
- LEAs submit for approval a CAP for each indicator found out of compliance through the desk review verification and implement the plan upon OSE approval
- LEAs provide documentation that demonstrates all noncompliance found for individual students has been corrected
- LEAs provide documentation that demonstrates the approved CAP was implemented and current practices meet compliance requirements for all indicators addressed in the CAP
- LEAs must demonstrate correction of noncompliance within one year of the date of the notification letter
- OSE conducts onsite reviews of selected LEAs based on a risk assessment. Any identified noncompliance must be corrected within one year of the date of the notification letter

Year Three - Train and Maintain:

- LEAs continue to monitor their policies, practices, and special education process and provide professional development opportunities to staff to ensure fidelity of implementation of the CAP

In addition to the three-year monitoring cycle, the following are conducted on an annual basis for all LEAs:

- Review of data reported through the state's data collection systems
- Identification and review of LEAs with significant disproportionality, disproportionate representation, or significant discrepancies in discipline
- Off-cycle onsite reviews as needed

DISPUTE RESOLUTION SYSTEM (STATE COMPLAINTS, MEDIATION, AND DUE PROCESS)

Timely resolution of complaints, mediations, and due process actions is required to ensure compliant dispute resolutions. Effective collection of data enables DESE to track the issues to determine whether patterns or trends exist. Additionally, through tracking issues over time, it is possible for DESE to evaluate the resolution's effectiveness and determine whether resolution was maintained in future situations. It also allows the state to identify issues which may need to be addressed through technical assistance or monitoring procedures.

Individualized Education Program (IEP) facilitation has been offered statewide since the 2016-17 school year. State-contracted facilitators are available to implement the facilitated IEP meeting process statewide. The OSE received technical assistance from the National Center on Dispute Resolution in Special Education (CADRE), as a member of the IEP Facilitation Intensive Technical Assistance Workgroup #2. Two facilitators are trained as trainers in order to enable local public agency personnel to be facilitators at the local level.

MONITORING FOR VOLUNTARY COORDINATED EARLY INTERVENING SERVICES (CEIS)

CEIS are services provided to students in kindergarten through grade 12 (with a particular emphasis on students in kindergarten through grade three) who are not currently identified as needing special education or related services but who need additional academic and behavioral supports to succeed in a general education environment. An LEA may not use more than 15 percent of the allocated amount under Part B for any fiscal year, less any amount reduced under adjustments to local fiscal year effort (34 CFR 300.205), if any, in combination with other amounts (which may include amounts other than education funds), to develop and implement CEIS. LEAs using IDEA Part B funds for CEIS must submit expenditure and student data information to DESE through the Part B Final Expenditure Report (FER) grid, supporting data page, and CEIS Reporting Verification Form.

The CEIS information submitted is reviewed by Special Education Finance staff, in consultation with other OSE staff as needed. Through approval or disapproval of the Part B FER, Special Education Finance staff informs LEAs of review findings. If findings conclude misuse of funds, the LEA is required to return these funds.

MONITORING FOR FISCAL COMPLIANCE

DESE implements a risk-based monitoring process in an effort to fulfill state and federal monitoring requirements for fiscal components. All LEAs, regardless of cohort, go through the desk audit level of monitoring each fiscal year. For Special Education Finance, this includes review of single audit findings, budget applications, payment requests, proportionate share carryover release requests, and final expenditure reports.

The LEAs identified with medium risk complete a self-assessment questionnaire and provide documentation to support any identified areas of concern. The LEAs determined to be at highest risk for the fiscal year are selected for on-site monitoring.

These methods serve as a tool for LEAs to determine compliance with federal fiscal regulations, identify any deficiencies, and subsequently implement procedural changes to correct such deficiencies.

Technical Assistance System:

The mechanisms that the State has in place to ensure the timely delivery of high quality, evidenced based technical assistance and support to LEAs.

STATE COMPLIANCE TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

Annual training and technical assistance is provided to LEAs for completing the self-assessment for compliance monitoring and fiscal compliance via face-to-face meetings, webinars, phone and e-mail communication, and web-based resources.

REGIONAL PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT CENTER (RPDC) CONSULTANTS

DESE contracts with nine RPDCs across Missouri to implement improvement activities to assist the state in meeting targets specified in the SPP/APR, to improve outcomes for students with disabilities, and to expand the state's capacity to provide timely regional services to LEAs with identified noncompliance and/or low performance for students with disabilities.

Over 100 regional consultants provide training and technical assistance to all LEAs in Missouri:

- Special education improvement consultants align, coordinate, and deliver professional development and coaching to special and general education staff to improve performance for students with disabilities
- Schoolwide Positive Behavior Supports (SW-PBS) consultants recruit and support LEAs and buildings for SW-PBS implementation, train LEA leadership, and train and mentor LEA SW-PBS coaches/facilitators
- Compliance consultants provide training and technical assistance to LEAs regarding IDEA compliance requirements, self-assessments, and developing/implementing corrective action plans
- Blindness skills specialists consult with LEAs in identification of and service planning for students who are blind or partially sighted
- District Continuous Improvement (DCI)/Coaching Support Team consultants assist LEAs in district-level implementation of effective educational foundation practices (collaborative data teams, common formative assessments, data-based decision making, and effective teaching practices)

PROJECT ACCESS

Project ACCESS provides autism and other pervasive developmental disorder support to LEAs and is 100 percent DESE funded. Project ACCESS designs autism specific professional development opportunities and credentials trainers through the RPDCs. Trainings are offered to LEA staff and educators working with individuals aged 0–21 who experience Autism Spectrum Disorders (ASD) and related disabilities. Onsite child specific consultations can be arranged through Missouri Autism Consultants (MACs) and LEA staff can be trained to be In-District Autism Consultants (IDACs). The Building Effective Autism Teams (BEAT) initiative is designed to increase local capacity for serving students with ASD.

MISSOURI SCHOOL FOR THE BLIND (MSB) OUTREACH PROGRAM

MSB provides outreach services to families and LEAs across the state in the areas of visual impairment, blind, and deaf/blind which include the following: Deaf/blind technical assistance program, Library Media Center, Missouri Instructional Resource Center, Missouri Statewide Parent Involvement Network (MoSPIN), professional development, service provider listings, vision education, and Orientation and Mobility services.

MoSPIN is a program to assist Missouri families with young children who are visually impaired by providing direct, in-home parent education through specially trained "parent advisors." MoSPIN focuses on the family rather than direct services to the child.

MISSOURI SCHOOLS FOR THE SEVERELY DISABLED (MSSD) OUTREACH PROGRAM

MSSD Outreach services are designed to support LEAs serving students with moderate/severe disabilities. Assistance includes resources; staff training; LEA staff development on instructional practice, curriculum, and assessment; and student-specific IEP technical assistance.

MISSOURI SCHOOL FOR THE DEAF (MSD) OUTREACH PROGRAM

The Resource Center on Deafness at MSD is Missouri's main source for programs, services, information, and resources supporting the educational

needs of deaf and hard of hearing children. The Resource Center provides a comprehensive range of programs and services to deaf and hard of hearing children, their parents, and their schools from birth until high school graduation in order to maximize educational achievement and psychosocial development. See <https://msd.dese.mo.gov/outreach-resources-center> for more information.

MISSOURI ASSISTIVE TECHNOLOGY (MO-AT)

MO-AT provides a variety of assistive technology statewide services to children, families, schools, and adults. Among other services, MO-AT operates a short-term device loan program that allows LEAs to try out devices prior to purchase; reimburses schools for the purchase of high-cost assistive devices; supports an equipment exchange and recycling program; and delivers technical assistance, consultation, and training support to LEA staff.

MISSOURI STATE UNIVERSITY (MSU) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

The MSU Department of Communication Sciences and Disorders (CSD) Speech, Language, and Hearing Clinic provides consultative services to LEAs educating children who have cochlear implants. Consultations and trainings are designed to enhance teacher and LEA knowledge and skills to increase student achievement.

MISSOURI SCHOOLWIDE POSITIVE BEHAVIOR SUPPORTS (MO SW-PBS)

The mission of MO SW-PBS is to assist LEAs and schools in establishing and maintaining effective social behavior systems in order to improve academic and behavior outcomes for all students. The MO SW-PBS State Leadership Team develops statewide standardized training for school, LEA, regional, and state levels. MO SW-PBS regularly collaborates and consults with the National Center on Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS) and the University of Missouri (MU) PBIS Center.

MISSOURI PARENT TRAINING AND INFORMATION (PTI) CENTER

Through a contract with the OSE, the Missouri Parents Act (MPACT) provides support to families of children with disabilities throughout the special education decision-making process. Supports include providing resources and information regarding special education law and process, assisting parents to plan for school meetings, and attending IEP and other educational meetings with families. Trained volunteer mentors also support parents in understanding their role in the IEP process. Mentors and staff complete a required training curriculum regarding working with families. Collaboration between the OSE and MPACT result in low level disagreement resolutions, training and information designed in common language, and ongoing direct parent engagement.

DISTRICT CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT (DCI)

DCI is an opportunity offered to LEAs in an effort to advance and sustain effective educational practices. Using a district-level, or LEA-level, approach, the goal is to integrate effective academic and behavioral practices into a framework for achieving exceptional student outcomes. The initial cohort of LEAs began working in the spring of 2017.

Through this approach, DESE seeks to achieve and facilitate a multi-tiered system of support at the LEA level to achieve exceptional outcomes for all students. This partnership between DESE and LEAs works toward the following outcomes:

- Refinement of an integrated academic and social/behavioral framework into a cohesive DCI system of support approach that can be implemented statewide in any LEA, regardless of demographics
- Collection of data pointing to the non-negotiables (what works) and data pointing to elements of flexibility to implementing in various contexts
- Implementation of effective educational practices (teaching, learning, and leadership), resulting in exceptional outcomes for all students, especially students showing risk factors, including students with disabilities

Professional Development System:

The mechanisms the State has in place to ensure that service providers have the skills to effectively provide services that improve results for children with disabilities.

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT IN MISSOURI

Missouri implements a comprehensive system of professional development to ensure that service providers have the skills needed to effectively provide services that improve results for students with disabilities.

REGIONAL PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT CENTER (RPDC) CONSULTANTS

Continuous professional development is provided for the following consultants located in the nine RPDCs: Compliance Consultants, Improvement Consultants, SW-PBS Consultants, and DCI Consultants. The professional development is provided through monthly team meetings, webinars and/or shared learning events with OSE staff related to the described scope of work according to the contract with DESE. The required meetings are designed to develop the capacity of the regional consultants to provide high quality professional development in their regions in order to assist the state in meeting the targets and indicators specified in the SPP, including the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP).

STATE PERSONNEL DEVELOPMENT GRANT (SPDG)

In October 2017, Missouri was awarded a five-year SPDG. The DCI project described above encompasses all elements of the previous SPDG work, but emphasis is placed on LEA-level implementation as opposed to building-level implementation. The LEAs are representative of all regions of the state and are demographically diverse. Currently approximately 150 LEAs or one-fourth of Missouri LEAs participate in the DCI.

LEAs participating in DCI are supported by coaching support teams comprised of consultants who assist in moving toward LEA-level implementation of the effective educational foundation practices (collaborative data teams, common formative assessments, data-based decision making, and effective teaching practices) used in the DCI work. In this model, consultants work cross-regionally to accommodate the needs of the participating LEAs.

MISSOURI PATHWAY FOR ASPIRING LEADERS (MoPAL)

MoPAL is a three-year DESE sponsored program. Individuals who currently hold a Missouri administrator certificate are eligible for participation at no cost. Through this program, aspiring special education leaders receive essential content through online professional learning modules, cohort learning experiences, coaching, and mentoring. During the first two years in the MoPAL program, participants complete a series of seven online modules focused on leadership issues in special education, including special education law, continuous improvement practices, special education finance, leadership for quality special education instructional practices including high impact instructional practices, data-based decision making, effective teaching and learning practices, and family/community participation. Participants are assigned a MoPAL consultant who helps anchor module content to real-world application through cohort meetings and one-on-one visits. During each participant's third year they receive individualized coaching and support as they complete a capstone project.

DYNAMIC LEARNING MAPS (DLM)

Dynamic Learning Maps (DLM) is the state alternate assessment for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities. DESE has trained staff in the Office of College and Career Readiness (OCCR) Assessment Section and the OSE on the administration of the DLM Assessment, as well as the

instructional support system which accompanies the assessment. These staff regularly train the RPDC Improvement Consultants on this same information so consultants can effectively train LEAs across the state. In addition, DLM staff works with and trains all RPDC Improvement Consultants annually on new information and technology available to educators. The RPDC Improvement Consultants provide training and technical assistance statewide to educators administering the DLM Alternate Assessment.

MISSOURI EARLY WARNING SIGNS

Early Warning Signs (EWS) is a data-driven decision-making process allowing educators to identify students at-risk by examining the underlying causes, match interventions to student needs, and monitor the progress of interventions. EWS examines five essential areas: adult advocates, academic support, classroom/social/behavioral issues, personalized learning environment/instructional practice, and necessary skills for graduation and post-school success. Data indicators are most predictive of a given student outcome as a "warning sign" that a student is in trouble. This system allows educators to track interventions assigned to particular students and track the associations between interventions and outcome for students.

SOCIAL-EMOTIONAL LEARNING FOR ALL (SEL-A)

SEL-A (formerly Missouri Postsecondary Success (MPSS)) is a multi-year transition and College and Career Competency (CCC) improvement initiative that provides on-site professional development and online support to interdisciplinary high school teams to enhance educators' capacity to support students' social-emotional learning. SEL-A articulates the instructional practices and implementation elements necessary to provide instruction on the research-based, teachable, transferable skills under three domains: intrapersonal, interpersonal, and cognitive to equip all students with competencies they need to become career-equipped, lifelong learners who are socially and emotionally engaged. The project emphasizes three elements for success: 1) collaboration between all stakeholders (e.g., administrators, general and special educators, counselors, service providers, families, community, etc.), 2) multi-tiered instruction and interventions, and 3) effective use of data to inform decision making at multiple levels. The project is not a separate initiative, standalone course/curriculum, or add-on; rather it aims to provide coaching, resources, and other supports to help schools build a sustainable culture of social-emotional learning, and as such, can be easily integrated with other initiatives/priorities.

Broad Stakeholder Input:

The mechanisms for soliciting broad stakeholder input on the State's targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that the State has made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP).

In Missouri, the Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) serves dual roles as an advisory group to the OSE and as the primary stakeholder group for Part B compliance and services. The SEAP reviewed SPP/APR data at each of their quarterly meetings during 2021 and provided overarching recommendations on targets after reviewing the feedback received from all stakeholders on all SPP/APR indicators, including the SSIP. The SEAP was also instrumental in helping to shape the outreach efforts for broader parent input. See the Introduction for additional information on broad stakeholder engagement.

Apply stakeholder involvement from introduction to all Part B results indicators (y/n)

YES

Number of Parent Members:

120

Parent Members Engagement:

Describe how the parent members of the State Advisory Panel, parent center staff, parents from local and statewide advocacy and advisory committees, and individual parents were engaged in setting targets, analyzing data, developing improvement strategies, and evaluating progress.

During 2021, the primary focus for SPP/APR stakeholder engagement was on analyzing data and setting targets, however stakeholders were also asked what is working and what is not working in terms of improvement strategies. The next phase of stakeholder engagement will focus on the improvement strategies that will enable the LEAs and the state to meet the new targets.

Parent members were engaged through multiple virtual meetings including the SEAP quarterly meetings, PTI MPACT Parent Mentor conferences, and an MPACT parent conference. Parents were also able to engage with the process via an SPP stakeholder webpage with indicator information and feedback surveys.

- SEAP: The SEAP met quarterly during 2021 and reviewed SPP indicator data and gave feedback on targets. SEAP members also shared SPP information with other stakeholder groups that they belong to, which included additional parents.
- PTI MPACT: The state presented virtually to PTI Parent Mentors and staff twice to discuss SPP indicator data and targets. The PTI was also instrumental in sharing the SPP stakeholder webpage through their parent newsletter.
- Missouri Counsel of Administrators of Special Education (MO-CASE): SPP information was shared with the MO-CASE board, with encouragement to the LEAs to share the SPP webpage information with families.
- Webpage with SPP indicator information and feedback surveys: A webpage dedicated to SPP stakeholder engagement was developed and broadly distributed and advertised (<https://dese.mo.gov/spp-spp-stakeholder-information>). The webpage was distributed via the Special Education Listserv, PTI newsletters, an advertisement in back to school information from the St. Louis Urban League, and the DESE website home page. This webpage will be used to share indicator information on an ongoing basis including improvement strategy and progress information.

All stakeholders were asked to provide feedback on targets via the surveys available on the SPP stakeholder engagement website. Survey results were shared with the SEAP, and they provided final recommendations on targets during their December 2, 2021, meeting.

Activities to Improve Outcomes for Children with Disabilities:

The activities conducted to increase the capacity of diverse groups of parents to support the development of implementation activities designed to improve outcomes for children with disabilities.

The surveys used throughout 2021 to gather feedback on future targets included questions about existing activities that are making a positive difference in outcomes, existing practices that may make a negative difference in outcomes, and activities that if implemented, could make a positive difference. Survey responses are available on <https://dese.mo.gov/spp-spp-stakeholder-information> and will be used as a foundation for future stakeholder activities regarding the development and/or implementation of improvement activities.

The diversity of parents who provided feedback (White: 68.3%, Black: 13.3%, Hispanic: 7.5%, Multi-racial: 6.7%) was very similar to the racial/ethnic proportions of the special education child count. This indicates that our stakeholder engagement approach of working with and through the SEAP and the PTI (MPACT), as well as publicizing information on our webpage, was successful. As stakeholder engagement shifts from a focus primarily on target setting to a focus on improvement activities and evaluation, we will work to broaden our reach to include more parents.

Soliciting Public Input:

The mechanisms and timelines for soliciting public input for setting targets, analyzing data, developing improvement strategies, and evaluating progress.

Throughout 2021, the OSE met with the SEAP during their quarterly meetings to review SPP indicator data, discuss targets, and give an overview of existing improvement activities. Similar information was shared with MPACT parent mentors on two occasions and with parents participating in an MPACT sponsored conference. Short videos or presentations provided trend data and target proposals for all indicators. This information was shared with the public via a webpage <https://dese.mo.gov/spp-apr-stakeholder-information>. As described above, this webpage contains summary information from the surveys and will be used to continuously inform stakeholder engagement on improvement strategies and evaluation of progress.

Making Results Available to the Public:

The mechanisms and timelines for making the results of the target setting, data analysis, development of the improvement strategies, and evaluation available to the public.

The SPP/APR contains final target decisions, while the webpage referenced above includes the 2021 target survey results and feedback on improvement strategies. We will continuously update and add improvement strategy and evaluation information to the webpage as well as engage with the SEAP and parent groups through MPACT.

Reporting to the Public

How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2019 performance of each LEA located in the State on the targets in the SPP/APR as soon as practicable, but no later than 120 days following the State's submission of its FFY 2019 APR, as required by 34 CFR §300.602(b)(1)(i)(A); and a description of where, on its Web site, a complete copy of the State's SPP/APR, including any revision if the State has revised the targets that it submitted with its FFY 2019 APR in 2021, is available.

PUBLIC REPORTING OF LEA DATA

The Special Education District Profiles are public reports of LEA data and are posted on DESE's Missouri Comprehensive Data System (MCDS) Portal at <https://apps.dese.mo.gov/MCDS/home.aspx?categoryid=5&view=2>. Scroll to the Special Education Profiles section and select "Special Education Profile Report – Public." Select a school year and district/LEA and click the View Report button, then use the arrows to advance through the pages of the report. An introduction to the report explains the purpose of the public reporting and the data displayed compares LEA status to each SPP target.

PUBLIC REPORTING OF STATEWIDE DATA AND STATE PERFORMANCE PLAN

The state's progress and/or slippage in meeting the measurable and rigorous targets found in the SPP are reported to the public in several ways. The State Profile is posted on the DESE website at <https://dese.mo.gov/special-education/data-reports> (Part B section) as well as with the District Profiles on the MCDS Portal. In most cases, data are displayed for multiple years so progress and/or slippage are evident.

The SPP/APR documents are posted on the DESE website at <http://dese.mo.gov/special-education/state-performance-plan>. The public are informed of the availability of these data via a Special Education Listserv which disseminates important information on special education topics to a wide range of stakeholders. These resources are also publicized at statewide conferences and training events.

Intro - Prior FFY Required Actions

While the State has publicly reported on the FFY 2018 (July 1, 2018-June 30, 2019) performance of each LEA located in the State on the targets in the State's performance plan as required by section 616(b)(2)(C)(ii)(I) of IDEA, those reports did not contain, as specified in the OSEP Response, all of the required information. With its FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the State must provide a Web link demonstrating that the State has fully reported to the public on the performance of each LEA located in the State on the targets in the SPP/APR for FFY 2018. In addition, the State must report with its FFY 2020 SPP/APR, how and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2019 performance of each LEA located in the State on the targets in the SPP/APR.

Response to actions required in FFY 2019 SPP/APR

As discussed with OSEP in April 2021, Missouri will include the state targets for Indicators 4A, 4B, 9, and 10 in the public reporting for 2020-21 data, required within 120 days of the February 1, 2022, submission of the FFY 2020 APR. The state targets will be added to the public reports at that time as part of the extensive revisions required due to indicator changes made in the new SPP/APR package.

Intro - OSEP Response

The State has not publicly reported on the FFY 2019 (July 1, 2019-June 30, 2020) and FFY 2018 (July 1, 2018-June 30, 2019) performance of each local educational agency (LEA) located in the State on the targets in the State's performance plan as required by section 616(b)(2)(C)(ii)(I) of IDEA.

Intro - Required Actions

The State has not publicly reported on the FFY 2019 (July 1, 2019-June 30, 2020) performance of each LEA located in the State on the targets in the State's performance plan as required by section 616(b)(2)(C)(ii)(I) of IDEA. With its FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the State must provide a Web link demonstrating that the State reported to the public on the performance of each LEA located in the State on the targets in the SPP/APR for FFY 2019 and FFY 2018. In addition, the State must report, with its FFY 2021 SPP/APR, how and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2020 performance of LEA located in the State on the targets in the SPP/APR.

Indicator 1: Graduation

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of youth with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) exiting special education due to graduating with a regular high school diploma. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Data Source

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), using the definitions in EDFacts file specification FS009.

Measurement

States must report a percentage using the number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to graduating with a regular high school diploma in the numerator and the number of all youth with IEPs who exited high school (ages 14-21) in the denominator.

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

Data for this indicator are "lag" data. Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, use data from 2019-2020), and compare the results to the target. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Include in the denominator the following exiting categories: (a) graduated with a regular high school diploma; (b) graduated with a state-defined alternate diploma; (c) received a certificate; (d) reached maximum age; or (e) dropped out.

Do not include in the denominator the number of youths with IEPs who exited special education due to: (a) transferring to regular education; or (b) who moved but are known to be continuing in an educational program.

Provide a narrative that describes the conditions youth must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma. If the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma are different, please explain.

1 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2019	82.80%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target >=	72.50%	73.00%	73.50%	74.00%	74.50%
Data	76.56%	77.46%	76.89%	75.76%	76.68%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=	83.00%	83.50%	84.00%	84.50%	85.00%	85.50%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

In Missouri, the Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) serves dual roles as an advisory group to the OSE and as the primary stakeholder group for Part B compliance and services. The SEAP reviewed SPP/APR data at each of their quarterly meetings during 2021 and provided overarching recommendations on targets after reviewing the feedback received from all stakeholders on all SPP/APR indicators, including the SSIP. The SEAP was also instrumental in helping to shape the outreach efforts for broader parent input. See the Introduction for additional information on broad stakeholder engagement.

Note that historical data and targets prior to FFY 2020 used a different data source and calculation (per OSEP requirements) and cannot be compared to FFY 2020 and future data and targets.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	5,801
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a state-defined alternate diploma (b)	0
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (c)	344

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (d)	42
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (e)	541

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to graduating with a regular high school diploma	Number of all youth with IEPs who exited special education (ages 14-21)	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
5,801	6,728	76.68%	83.00%	86.22%	Met target	N/A

Graduation Conditions

Provide a narrative that describes the conditions youth must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma.

The state of Missouri has developed guidelines for graduation requirements for students in Missouri's public schools. These guidelines include policy considerations for students with disabilities served under IDEA. Those guidelines include the following provisions:

- Each school district must provide FAPE for students with disabilities until they are graduated with a regular diploma or attain the age of 21 years.
- Local school boards must establish policies and guidelines that ensure that students with disabilities have the opportunity to earn credits toward graduation in a nondiscriminatory manner within the spirit and intent of that requirement as follows:

1. Any specific graduation requirement may be waived for a student with a disability if recommended by the student's IEP team.
2. Students with disabilities will receive grades and have credit transcribed in the same manner as all other students when they complete the same courses as other students.

3. Students with disabilities who complete regular courses modified as indicated in their IEPs will receive grades and have credit transcribed in the same manner as students who complete the courses without modification. The fact that the courses were modified may be noted on the transcript.

- Students with disabilities who meet state and local graduation credit requirements by taking and passing regular courses, taking and passing regular courses with modification, taking and passing modified classes, or successfully achieving IEP goals and objectives shall be graduated and receive regular high school diplomas.

- Students with disabilities who reach age twenty-one (21), or otherwise terminate their education, and who have met the district's attendance requirements but who have not completed the requirements for graduation, receive a certificate of attendance.

Are the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet to graduate with a regular high school diploma different from the conditions noted above? (yes/no)

NO

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

COVID-19 impact: COVID-19 school closures in March 2020 resulted in a lower number of dropouts reported in 2019-20 than in previous years. With the revised indicator measurement for graduates as a percent of exiters, a lower number of dropouts in the denominator resulted in a higher than normal percent of graduates.

1 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

1 - OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2019, and OSEP accepts that revision.

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

1 - Required Actions

Indicator 2: Drop Out

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of youth with IEPs who exited special education due to dropping out. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Data Source

OPTION 1:

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), using the definitions in EDFacts file specification FS009.

OPTION 2 (For FFY 2020 ONLY):

Use same data source and measurement that the State used to report in its FFY 2010 SPP/APR that was submitted on February 1, 2012.

Measurement

OPTION 1:

States must report a percentage using the number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out in the numerator and the number of all youth with IEPs who exited special education (ages 14-21) in the denominator.

OPTION 2 (For FFY 2020 ONLY):

Use same data source and measurement that the State used to report in its FFY 2010 SPP/APR that was submitted on February 1, 2012.

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

Data for this indicator are "lag" data. Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, use data from 2019-2020), and compare the results to the target.

With the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2022, States may use either option 1 or 2. States using Option 2 must provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

OPTION 1:

Use 618 exiting data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, use data from 2019-2020). Include in the denominator the following exiting categories: (a) graduated with a regular high school diploma; (b) graduated with a state-defined alternate diploma; (c) received a certificate; (d) reached maximum age; or (e) dropped out.

Do not include in the denominator the number of youths with IEPs who exited special education due to: (a) transferring to regular education; or (b) who moved, but are known to be continuing in an educational program.

OPTION 2:

Use the annual event school dropout rate for students leaving a school in a single year determined in accordance with the National Center for Education Statistic's Common Core of Data.

If the State has made or proposes to make changes to the data source or measurement under Option 2, when compared to the information reported in its FFY 2010 SPP/APR submitted on February 1, 2012, the State should include a justification as to why such changes are warranted.

Options 1 and 2:

Provide a narrative that describes what counts as dropping out for all youth. Please explain if there is a difference between what counts as dropping out for all students and what counts as dropping out for students with IEPs.

Beginning with the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2023, States must report data using Option 1 (i.e., the same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the IDEA). Option 2 will not be available beginning with the FFY 2021 SPP/APR.

2 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2019	10.67%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target <=	4.80%	4.80%	4.80%	4.80%	3.50%
Data	2.36%	2.20%	2.24%	2.17%	1.92%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target <=	11.00%	11.00%	10.80%	10.60%	10.40%	10.20%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

In Missouri, the Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) serves dual roles as an advisory group to the OSE and as the primary stakeholder group for Part B compliance and services. The SEAP reviewed SPP/APR data at each of their quarterly meetings during 2021 and provided overarching recommendations on targets after reviewing the feedback received from all stakeholders on all SPP/APR indicators, including the SSIP. The SEAP was also instrumental in helping to shape the outreach efforts for broader parent input. See the Introduction for additional information on broad stakeholder engagement.

Note that historical data and targets prior to FFY 2020 use a different data source and calculation and cannot be compared to FFY 2020 and future data and targets.

Please indicate the reporting option used on this indicator

Option 1

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	5,801
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a state-defined alternate diploma (b)	0
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (c)	344
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (d)	42
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (e)	541

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out	Number of all youth with IEPs who exited special education (ages 14-21)	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
541	6,728	1.92%	11.00%	8.04%	Met target	N/A

Provide a narrative that describes what counts as dropping out for all youth

Dropouts include any students who exit high school without receiving a high school diploma. Conditions for dropping out for students with disabilities are the same as for all students.

Is there a difference in what counts as dropping out for youth with IEPs? (yes/no)

NO

If yes, explain the difference in what counts as dropping out for youth with IEPs.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

COVID-19 impact: COVID-19 school closures in March 2020 resulted in a lower number of dropouts reported in 2019-20 than in previous years. Dropout counts for 2020-21 returned to pre-COVID levels, suggesting that the 2019-20 dip was a result of COVID-19 disruptions.

2 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

2 - OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2019, and OSEP accepts that revision.

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

2 - Required Actions

Indicator 3A: Participation for Children with IEPs

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:

- A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.
- D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level academic achievement standards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Data Source

3A. Same data as used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using EDFacts file specifications FS185 and 188.

Measurement

A. Participation rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs participating in an assessment) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs enrolled during the testing window)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. The participation rate is based on all children with IEPs, including both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

Instructions

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Include information regarding where to find public reports of assessment participation and performance results, as required by 34 CFR §300.160(f), *i.e.*, a link to the Web site where these data are reported.

Indicator 3A: Provide separate reading/language arts and mathematics participation rates for children with IEPs for each of the following grades: 4, 8, & high school. Account for ALL children with IEPs, in grades 4, 8, and high school, including children not participating in assessments and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

3A - Indicator Data

Historical Data:

Subject	Group	Group Name	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
Reading	A	Grade 4	2020	98.23%
Reading	B	Grade 8	2020	97.37%
Reading	C	Grade HS	2020	96.51%
Math	A	Grade 4	2020	98.15%
Math	B	Grade 8	2020	97.25%
Math	C	Grade HS	2020	95.30%

Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A >=	Grade 4	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Reading	B >=	Grade 8	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Reading	C >=	Grade HS	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Math	A >=	Grade 4	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Math	B >=	Grade 8	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Math	C >=	Grade HS	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

In Missouri, the Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) serves dual roles as an advisory group to the OSE and as the primary stakeholder group for Part B compliance and services. The SEAP reviewed SPP/APR data at each of their quarterly meetings during 2021 and provided overarching recommendations on targets after reviewing the feedback received from all stakeholders on all SPP/APR indicators, including the SSIP. The SEAP was also instrumental in helping to shape the outreach efforts for broader parent input. See the Introduction for additional information on broad stakeholder engagement.

FFY 2020 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts**Data Source:**

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS188; Data Group: 589)

Date:

03/30/2022

Reading Assessment Participation Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs*	9,400	8,972	8,544
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	8,436	3,001	7,699
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	307	5,200	44
d. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	491	535	503

Data Source:

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS185; Data Group: 588)

Date:

03/30/2022

Math Assessment Participation Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs*	9,387	8,961	8,999
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	5,855	5,678	8,048
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	2,870	2,504	28
d. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	488	533	500

*The children with IEPs count excludes children with disabilities who were reported as exempt due to significant medical emergency in row a for all the prefilled data in this indicator.

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	Number of Children with IEPs	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	9,234	9,400		95.00%	98.23%	N/A	N/A
B	Grade 8	8,736	8,972		95.00%	97.37%	N/A	N/A
C	Grade HS	8,246	8,544		95.00%	96.51%	N/A	N/A

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	Number of Children with IEPs	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	9,213	9,387		95.00%	98.15%	N/A	N/A

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	Number of Children with IEPs	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
B	Grade 8	8,715	8,961		95.00%	97.25%	N/A	N/A
C	Grade HS	8,576	8,999		95.00%	95.30%	N/A	N/A

Regulatory Information

The SEA, (or, in the case of a district-wide assessment, LEA) must make available to the public, and report to the public with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessment of nondisabled children: (1) the number of children with disabilities participating in: (a) regular assessments, and the number of those children who were provided accommodations in order to participate in those assessments; and (b) alternate assessments aligned with alternate achievement standards; and (2) the performance of children with disabilities on regular assessments and on alternate assessments, compared with the achievement of all children, including children with disabilities, on those assessments. [20 U.S.C. 1412 (a)(16)(D); 34 CFR §300.160(f)]

Public Reporting Information

Provide links to the page(s) where you provide public reports of assessment results.

Public reports of assessment data are available on DESE's MCDS Portal at <https://apps.dese.mo.gov/MCDS/home.aspx?categoryid=5&view=2>

State, district, and school level data including state level participation and proficiency, and district and school level participation are under the Special Education "Part B Federal Reporting" section.

State and LEA level Special Education Profiles are under the Special Education "Special Education Profiles" section. To run the LEA level report, select "Special Education Profile Report – Public." Select a Year and District. Click the View Report button. Go to page 7 for assessment data.

Also available on the MCDS Portal are state, LEA, and building level proficiency data for all students as well as the following subgroups: children with disabilities on regular assessments (IEP Non MAPA), children with disabilities on alternate assessments (MAP-Alternate or IEP MAPA), and all children with disabilities (IEP_student). To access these data, on the MCDS left hand menu, select the "Students" category, then the "Missouri Assessment Program (MAP) Data" subcategory. Select "Achievement Level 4 Report – Public" report. Select a District (e.g. Jefferson City), School Year(s), Summary Level (State Overall, District Overall and/or select schools within the district), Content Area(s), Category (select Special Programs and Total), Type (select IEP MAPA, IEP Non MAPA, IEP_student, Total), Grade Level (select all). Click the View Report button on the upper right side of screen.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

COVID-19 impact: Proficiency rates for all students decreased from 2018-19 to 2020-21, presumably due to COVID-19 disruptions in education. While state assessment participation rates were lower than usual in 2020-21, the participation rate for students with disabilities remained above 95 percent.

3A - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3A - OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2020, and OSEP accepts that revision.

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

3A - Required Actions

Indicator 3B: Proficiency for Children with IEPs (Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards)

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:

- A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.
- D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level academic achievement standards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Data Source

3B. Same data as used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using EDFacts file specifications FS175 and 178.

Measurement

B. Proficiency rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs who received a valid score and for whom a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. The proficiency rate includes both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

Instructions

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Include information regarding where to find public reports of assessment participation and performance results, as required by 34 CFR §300.160(f), i.e., a link to the Web site where these data are reported.

Indicator 3B: Proficiency calculations in this SPP/APR must result in proficiency rates for children with IEPs on the regular assessment in reading/language arts and mathematics assessments (separately) in each of the following grades: 4, 8, and high school, including both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

3B - Indicator Data

Historical Data:

Subject	Group	Group Name	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
Reading	A	Grade 4	2020	17.48%
Reading	B	Grade 8	2020	11.69%
Reading	C	Grade HS	2020	14.79%
Math	A	Grade 4	2020	14.56%
Math	B	Grade 8	2020	7.88%
Math	C	Grade HS	2020	7.28%

Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A >=	Grade 4	17.48%	18.00%	20.00%	21.00%	22.00%	23.00%
Reading	B >=	Grade 8	11.69%	12.00%	13.00%	13.50%	14.00%	14.50%
Reading	C >=	Grade HS	14.79%	15.00%	17.00%	17.50%	18.00%	18.50%
Math	A >=	Grade 4	14.56%	15.50%	16.50%	18.00%	19.00%	20.00%
Math	B >=	Grade 8	7.88%	8.00%	9.00%	9.50%	10.00%	11.00%
Math	C >=	Grade HS	7.28%	8.00%	9.50%	11.00%	12.50%	13.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

In Missouri, the Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) serves dual roles as an advisory group to the OSE and as the primary stakeholder group for Part B compliance and services. The SEAP reviewed SPP/APR data at each of their quarterly meetings during 2021 and provided overarching recommendations on targets after reviewing the feedback received from all stakeholders on all SPP/APR indicators, including the SSIP. The SEAP was also instrumental in helping to shape the outreach efforts for broader parent input. See the Introduction for additional information on broad stakeholder engagement.

FFY 2020 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Data Source:

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

Date:

03/03/2022

Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment	8,743	8,201	7,743
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	1,498	601	1,139
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	30	358	6

Data Source:

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

Date:

03/03/2022

Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment	8,725	8,182	8,076
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	1,133	576	588
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	137	69	0

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Regular Assessment	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	1,528	8,743		17.48%	17.48%	N/A	N/A
B	Grade 8	959	8,201		11.69%	11.69%	N/A	N/A
C	Grade HS	1,145	7,743		14.79%	14.79%	N/A	N/A

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Regular Assessment	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	1,270	8,725		14.56%	14.56%	N/A	N/A
B	Grade 8	645	8,182		7.88%	7.88%	N/A	N/A
C	Grade HS	588	8,076		7.28%	7.28%	N/A	N/A

Regulatory Information

The SEA, (or, in the case of a district-wide assessment, LEA) must make available to the public, and report to the public with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessment of nondisabled children: (1) the number of children with disabilities participating in: (a) regular assessments, and the number of those children who were provided accommodations in order to participate in those assessments; and (b) alternate assessments aligned with alternate achievement standards; and (2) the performance of children with disabilities on regular assessments and on alternate assessments, compared with the achievement of all children, including children with disabilities, on those assessments. [20 U.S.C. 1412 (a)(16)(D); 34 CFR §300.160(f)]

Public Reporting Information

Provide links to the page(s) where you provide public reports of assessment results.

Public reports of assessment data are available on DESE's MCDS Portal at <https://apps.dese.mo.gov/MCDS/home.aspx?categoryid=5&view=2>

State, district, and school level data including state level participation and proficiency, and district and school level participation are under the Special Education "Part B Federal Reporting" section.

State and LEA level Special Education Profiles are under the Special Education "Special Education Profiles" section. To run the LEA level report, select "Special Education Profile Report – Public." Select a Year and District. Click the View Report button. Go to page 7 for assessment data.

Also available on the MCDS Portal are state, LEA, and building level proficiency data for all students as well as the following subgroups: children with disabilities on regular assessments (IEP Non MAPA), children with disabilities on alternate assessments (MAP-Alternate or IEP MAPA), and all children with disabilities (IEP_student). To access these data, on the MCDS left hand menu, select the "Students" category, then the "Missouri Assessment Program (MAP) Data" subcategory. Select "Achievement Level 4 Report – Public" report. Select a District (e.g. Jefferson City), School Year(s), Summary Level (State Overall, District Overall and/or select schools within the district), Content Area(s), Category (select Special Programs and Total), Type (select IEP MAPA, IEP Non MAPA, IEP_student, Total), Grade Level (select all). Click the View Report button on the upper right side of screen.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

COVID-19 impact: Proficiency rates for all students decreased from 2018-19 to 2020-21, presumably due to COVID-19 disruptions in education. While state assessment participation rates were lower than usual in 2020-21, the participation rate for students with disabilities remained above 95 percent.

3B - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3B - OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2020, and OSEP accepts that revision.

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

3B - Required Actions

Indicator 3C: Proficiency for Children with IEPs (Alternate Academic Achievement Standards)

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:

- A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.
- D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level academic achievement standards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Data Source

3C. Same data as used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using EDFacts file specifications FS175 and 178.

Measurement

C. Proficiency rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against alternate academic achievement standards) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs who received a valid score and for whom a proficiency level was assigned for the alternate assessment)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. The proficiency rate includes both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

Instructions

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Include information regarding where to find public reports of assessment participation and performance results, as required by 34 CFR §300.160(f), i.e., a link to the Web site where these data are reported.

Indicator 3C: Proficiency calculations in this SPP/APR must result in proficiency rates for children with IEPs on the alternate assessment in reading/language arts and mathematics assessments (separately) in each of the following grades: 4, 8, and high school, including both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

3C - Indicator Data

Historical Data:

Subject	Group	Group Name	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
Reading	A	Grade 4	2020	28.92%
Reading	B	Grade 8	2020	18.32%
Reading	C	Grade HS	2020	14.12%
Math	A	Grade 4	2020	9.63%
Math	B	Grade 8	2020	9.57%
Math	C	Grade HS	2020	7.40%

Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A >=	Grade 4	28.92%	30.00%	31.00%	33.00%	34.00%	34.00%
Reading	B >=	Grade 8	18.32%	19.00%	19.50%	20.00%	20.50%	21.00%
Reading	C >=	Grade HS	14.12%	15.00%	15.50%	16.00%	16.50%	17.00%
Math	A >=	Grade 4	9.63%	11.00%	12.00%	12.50%	13.00%	13.50%
Math	B >=	Grade 8	9.57%	10.00%	10.50%	11.00%	11.50%	12.00%
Math	C >=	Grade HS	7.40%	8.00%	9.00%	9.50%	10.00%	10.50%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

In Missouri, the Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) serves dual roles as an advisory group to the OSE and as the primary stakeholder group for Part B compliance and services. The SEAP reviewed SPP/APR data at each of their quarterly meetings during 2021 and provided overarching recommendations on targets after reviewing the feedback received from all stakeholders on all SPP/APR indicators, including the SSIP. The SEAP was also instrumental in helping to shape the outreach efforts for broader parent input. See the Introduction for additional information on broad stakeholder engagement.

FFY 2020 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts**Data Source:**

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

Date:

03/03/2022

Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the alternate assessment	491	535	503
b. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient	142	98	71

Data Source:

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

Date:

03/03/2022

Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the alternate assessment	488	533	500
b. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient	47	51	37

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Alternate Academic Achievement Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Alternate Assessment	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	142	491		28.92%	28.92%	N/A	N/A
B	Grade 8	98	535		18.32%	18.32%	N/A	N/A
C	Grade HS	71	503		14.12%	14.12%	N/A	N/A

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Alternate Academic Achievement Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Alternate Assessment	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	47	488		9.63%	9.63%	N/A	N/A
B	Grade 8	51	533		9.57%	9.57%	N/A	N/A
C	Grade HS	37	500		7.40%	7.40%	N/A	N/A

Regulatory Information

The SEA, (or, in the case of a district-wide assessment, LEA) must make available to the public, and report to the public with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessment of nondisabled children: (1) the number of children with disabilities participating in: (a) regular assessments, and the number of those children who were provided accommodations in order to participate in those assessments; and (b) alternate assessments aligned with alternate achievement standards; and (2) the performance of children with disabilities on regular assessments and on alternate assessments, compared with the achievement of all children, including children with disabilities, on those assessments. [20 U.S.C. 1412 (a)(16)(D); 34 CFR §300.160(f)]

Public Reporting Information

Provide links to the page(s) where you provide public reports of assessment results.

Public reports of assessment data are available on DESE's MCDS Portal at <https://apps.dese.mo.gov/MCDS/home.aspx?categoryid=5&view=2>

State, district, and school level data including state level participation and proficiency, and district and school level participation are under the Special Education "Part B Federal Reporting" section.

State and LEA level Special Education Profiles are under the Special Education "Special Education Profiles" section. To run the LEA level report, select "Special Education Profile Report – Public." Select a Year and District. Click the View Report button. Go to page 7 for assessment data.

Also available on the MCDS Portal are state, LEA, and building level proficiency data for all students as well as the following subgroups: children with disabilities on regular assessments (IEP Non MAPA), children with disabilities on alternate assessments (MAP-Alternate or IEP MAPA), and all children with disabilities (IEP_student). To access these data, on the MCDS left hand menu, select the "Students" category, then the "Missouri Assessment Program (MAP) Data" subcategory. Select "Achievement Level 4 Report – Public" report. Select a District (e.g. Jefferson City), School Year(s), Summary Level (State Overall, District Overall and/or select schools within the district), Content Area(s), Category (select Special Programs and Total), Type (select IEP MAPA, IEP Non MAPA, IEP_student, Total), Grade Level (select all). Click the View Report button on the upper right side of screen.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

COVID-19 impact: Proficiency rates for alternate assessment students decreased from 2018-19 to 2020-21, presumably due to COVID-19 disruptions in education.

3C - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3C - OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2020, and OSEP accepts that revision.

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

3C - Required Actions

Indicator 3D: Gap in Proficiency Rates (Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards)

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:

- A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.
- D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level academic achievement standards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Data Source

3D. Same data as used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using EDFacts file specifications FS175 and 178.

Measurement

D. Proficiency rate gap = [(proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2020-2021 school year) subtracted from the (proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2020-2021 school year)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. The proficiency rate includes all children enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

Instructions

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Include information regarding where to find public reports of assessment participation and performance results, as required by 34 CFR §300.160(f), *i.e.*, a link to the Web site where these data are reported.

Indicator 3D: Gap calculations in this SPP/APR must result in the proficiency rate for children with IEPs were proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2020-2021 school year compared to the proficiency rate for all students who were proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2020-2021 school year. Calculate separately for reading/language arts and math in each of the following grades: 4, 8, and high school, including both children enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

3D - Indicator Data

Historical Data:

Subject	Group	Group Name	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
Reading	A	Grade 4	2020	31.15
Reading	B	Grade 8	2020	34.25
Reading	C	Grade HS	2020	40.09
Math	A	Grade 4	2020	25.29
Math	B	Grade 8	2020	26.22
Math	C	Grade HS	2020	24.32

Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A <=	Grade 4	31.15	31.00	30.50	30.00	29.50	29.00
Reading	B <=	Grade 8	34.25	34.00	33.50	33.00	32.50	32.00
Reading	C <=	Grade HS	40.09	40.00	39.50	39.00	38.50	38.00
Math	A <=	Grade 4	25.29	25.00	24.50	24.00	23.50	23.00
Math	B <=	Grade 8	26.22	26.00	25.50	25.00	24.50	24.00
Math	C <=	Grade HS	24.32	24.00	23.50	23.00	22.50	22.00

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

In Missouri, the Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) serves dual roles as an advisory group to the OSE and as the primary stakeholder group for Part B compliance and services. The SEAP reviewed SPP/APR data at each of their quarterly meetings during 2021 and provided overarching recommendations on targets after reviewing the feedback received from all stakeholders on all SPP/APR indicators, including the SSIP. The SEAP was also instrumental in helping to shape the outreach efforts for broader parent input. See the Introduction for additional information on broad stakeholder engagement.

FFY 2020 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts
Data Source:

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

Date:

03/03/2022

Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. All Students who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	61,851	66,012	63,199
b. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	8,743	8,201	7,743
c. All students in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	30,031	29,802	34,677
d. All students in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	43	527	7
e. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	1,498	601	1,139
f. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	30	358	6

Data Source:

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

Date:

03/03/2022

Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. All Students who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	61,840	65,897	67,542
b. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	8,725	8,182	8,076
c. All students in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	24,481	22,392	21,340
d. All students in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	159	78	1
e. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	1,133	576	588
f. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	137	69	0

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	Proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	17.48%	48.62%		31.15	31.15	N/A	N/A

Group	Group Name	Proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	Proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
B	Grade 8	11.69%	45.94%		34.25	34.25	N/A	N/A
C	Grade HS	14.79%	54.88%		40.09	40.09	N/A	N/A

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	Proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	14.56%	39.84%		25.29	25.29	N/A	N/A
B	Grade 8	7.88%	34.10%		26.22	26.22	N/A	N/A
C	Grade HS	7.28%	31.60%		24.32	24.32	N/A	N/A

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

3D - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3D - OSEP Response

The State has established the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2020, and OSEP accepts that baseline.

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

3D - Required Actions

Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results Indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

- A. Percent of local educational agencies (LEA) that have a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and
- B. Percent of LEAs that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A); 1412(a)(22))

Data Source

State discipline data, including State's analysis of State's Discipline data collected under IDEA Section 618, where applicable. Discrepancy can be computed by either comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to rates for nondisabled children within the LEA or by comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State.

Measurement

Percent = [(# of LEAs that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) that have a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions for more than 10 days during the school year of children with IEPs) divided by the (# of LEAs in the State that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable))] times 100.

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

Instructions

If the State has established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, LEAs that met that State-established n and/or cell size. If the State used a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, report the number of LEAs excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement.

Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, use data from 2019-2020), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies, as defined by the State, are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions (more than 10 days during the school year) of children with IEPs, as required at 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(22). The State's examination must include one of the following comparisons:

- The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State; or
- The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to nondisabled children within the LEAs

In the description, specify which method the State used to determine possible discrepancies and explain what constitutes those discrepancies.

Because the measurement table requires that the data examined for this indicator are lag year data, States should examine the 618 data that was submitted by LEAs that were in operation during the school year before the reporting year. For example, if a State has 100 LEAs operating in the 2019-2020 school year, those 100 LEAs would have reported 618 data in 2019-2020 on the number of children suspended/expelled. If the State then opens 15 new LEAs in 2020-2021, suspension/expulsion data from those 15 new LEAs would not be in the 2019-2020 618 data set, and therefore, those 15 new LEAs should not be included in the denominator of the calculation. States must use the number of LEAs from the year before the reporting year in its calculation for this indicator. For the FFY 2020 SPP/APR submission, States must use the number of LEAs reported in 2019-2020 (which can be found in the FFY 2019 SPP/APR introduction).

Indicator 4A: Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation (based upon districts that met the minimum n and/or cell size requirement, if applicable).

If significant discrepancies occurred, describe how the State educational agency reviewed and, if appropriate, revised (or required the affected local educational agency to revise) its policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, to ensure that such policies, procedures, and practices comply with applicable requirements.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If discrepancies occurred and the LEA with discrepancies had policies, procedures or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, and that do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, describe how the State ensured that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with (OSEP) Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

4A - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2016	2.86%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target <=	1.80%	2.86%	3.00%	2.85%	2.85%
Data	0.00%	2.86%	0.00%	5.26%	4.65%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target ≤	6.10%	6.10%	6.10%	6.10%	6.10%	2.85%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

In Missouri, the Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) serves dual roles as an advisory group to the OSE and as the primary stakeholder group for Part B compliance and services. The SEAP reviewed SPP/APR data at each of their quarterly meetings during 2021 and provided overarching recommendations on targets after reviewing the feedback received from all stakeholders on all SPP/APR indicators, including the SSIP. The SEAP was also instrumental in helping to shape the outreach efforts for broader parent input. See the Introduction for additional information on broad stakeholder engagement.

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

Has the state established a minimum n/cell-size requirement? (yes/no)

YES

If yes, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, LEAs that met the State-established n/cell size. Report the number of LEAs excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.

498

Number of LEAs that have a significant discrepancy	Number of LEAs that met the State's minimum n/cell size	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
2	33	4.65%	6.10%	6.06%	Met target	No Slippage

Choose one of the following comparison methodologies to determine whether significant discrepancies are occurring (34 CFR §300.170(a))

The rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs in each LEA compared to the rates for nondisabled children in the same LEA

State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology

For each LEA with at least ten discipline incidents (minimum cell size) for students with disabilities, the following ratio is calculated:

- Discipline Incident Rate for Students with Disabilities (number of incidents for students with disabilities / special education child count) compared to
- Discipline Incident Rate for Non-disabled Students (number of incidents for non-disabled students / non-disabled enrollment)

Missouri uses the same definition for "significant discrepancy" for Indicators 4A and 4B. An LEA is considered to have a significant discrepancy when the above ratio exceeds 4.0 for two consecutive years and if the average number of incidents per 100 students with disabilities is greater than 2.0 and/or the average number of incidents per 100 nondisabled students is greater than 1.0. This determination of significant discrepancies in suspension/expulsion rates, which considers a rolling two years of data, is conducted on an annual basis for every LEA in the state. Discipline incidents included in this analysis are any incidents resulting in out of school suspensions for more than ten days, both consecutive and cumulative. Multiple short suspensions summing to more than ten days are counted as a single incident for a student, in addition to any suspensions more than ten consecutive days. For example, if one student received five separate out of school suspensions of 20 days, 15 days, 8 days, 4 days, and 1 day, three counts of "suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days" would be included in the calculations: one for the 20 days, one for the 15 days, and one for 13 days (sum of 8, 4, and 1 days).

Please see additional information below which explains why the "number of districts excluded from the calculation" plus the "number of districts that met the state's minimum n-size" does not equal the total number of districts in the state.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

COVID-19 impact: The number of long-term out of school removals for students with disabilities reported for 2019-20 was approximately 33% lower than the prior school year due to COVID-19 school closures beginning in March 2020. The primary impact for this indicator is that fewer districts met the minimum n-size to be included in the analysis. The same number of districts met significant discrepancy criteria as the prior year, but the smaller denominator caused the resulting percent of districts to increase.

The following information describes why the "number of districts excluded from the calculation" plus the "number of districts that met the state's minimum n-size" does not equal the total number of districts in the state.

One of the service delivery options available under state statute is the creation of a special school district pursuant to Section 162.825, RSMo. The referendum of establishing a special school district creates a distinct public school district for the purpose of providing special education and related services to students with disabilities within the component districts of which it is comprised. Special School District of St. Louis County, which serves 22 component districts and Special School District of Pemiscot County, which serves seven component districts, are two such agencies in Missouri. As these special school districts have immediate responsibility for both policy development and implementation of federal IDEA Part B requirements and receive IDEA Part B dollars directly, the agencies identified and reviewed for SPP Indicators 4AB, 9, and 10 are the two "special school districts" whose data are comprised of all data from the components districts (for example, the data from the seven component districts of Pemiscot Special School District are aggregated into a single special school district). The two special school districts, along with each of the component districts, are included in the total number of LEAs included in the Introduction to the APR.

Therefore, the LEAs reported in the FFY 2019 Introduction are accounted for as follows:

- 560 LEAs reported in FFY 2019 Introduction which includes the two special school districts and the 29 component districts of the two special school districts
- Less 22 component districts of St. Louis County Special School District

- Less 7 component districts of Pemiscot County Special School District
- Less 33 LEAs that met the State's minimum cell size (includes one of the special school districts)
- Results in 498 LEAs excluded from calculations due to not meeting minimum cell size (includes one of the special school districts).

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2020 using 2019-2020 data)

Provide a description of the review of policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

Data for all LEAs are reviewed annually to determine potential significant discrepancies in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs. All LEAs who meet the criteria are provided the opportunity to verify their data.

LEAs meeting criteria for significant discrepancies are subject to a review of policies, procedures, and practices relating to discipline of students with disabilities. The purpose of the reviews is to gather information to determine whether the LEA's policies, procedures, and practices related to discipline contributed to the significant discrepancy regarding discipline of students with disabilities, and to determine whether the policies, procedures, and practices comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards. This process was modified for reviews occurring during the 2018-19 school year to assist LEAs in more accurately analyzing data and identifying possible root causes relating to the significant discrepancies. The reviews occur across a three-year monitoring cycle. The first year an LEA is identified, a self-assessment is required. The second and third consecutive years an LEA is identified, a goal progress report based on the prior self-assessment is required. If an LEA is identified another consecutive year following the third year, the monitoring cycle begins again, and the LEA participates in a new self-assessment. While LEAs may review student files as a part of their self-assessment, a formal student file review will be conducted by the OSE on an as-needed basis. The OSE may determine that an onsite review is necessary at any point in the process.

The self-assessment consists of a series of questions related to policies, procedures, and practices across two topic areas (effective practices and compliance) to be answered by specific schools identified by the LEA. Based on results from the self-assessment, goals and activities are developed. The goal progress report, completed in years two and three, gives updates regarding the status of the goals and activities specified in the self-assessment.

The State DID NOT identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
0			0

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

4A - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

4A - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

4A - Required Actions

Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Compliance Indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

- A. Percent of local educational agencies (LEA) that have a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and
- B. Percent of LEAs that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A); 1412(a)(22))

Data Source

State discipline data, including State's analysis of State's Discipline data collected under IDEA Section 618, where applicable. Discrepancy can be computed by either comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to rates for nondisabled children within the LEA or by comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State.

Measurement

Percent = [(# of LEAs that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, by race or ethnicity, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of more than 10 days during the school year of children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards) divided by the (# of LEAs in the State that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups)] times 100.

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

Instructions

If the State has established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, LEAs that met that State-established n and/or cell size. If the State used a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, report the number of LEAs totally excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement.

Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, use data from 2019-2020), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies, as defined by the State, are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions (more than 10 days during the school year) of children with IEPs, as required at 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(22). The State's examination must include one of the following comparisons:

- The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State; or
- The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to nondisabled children within the LEAs

In the description, specify which method the State used to determine possible discrepancies and explain what constitutes those discrepancies.

Because the measurement table requires that the data examined for this indicator are lag year data, States should examine the 618 data that was submitted by LEAs that were in operation during the school year before the reporting year. For example, if a State has 100 LEAs operating in the 2019-2020 school year, those 100 LEAs would have reported 618 data in 2019-2020 on the number of children suspended/expelled. If the State then opens 15 new LEAs in 2020-2021, suspension/expulsion data from those 15 new LEAs would not be in the 2019-2020 618 data set, and therefore, those 15 new LEAs should not be included in the denominator of the calculation. States must use the number of LEAs from the year before the reporting year in its calculation for this indicator. For the FFY 2020 SPP/APR submission, States must use the number of LEAs reported in 2019-2020 (which can be found in the FFY 2019 SPP/APR introduction).

Indicator 4B: Provide the following: (a) the number of LEAs that met the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups that have a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, by race or ethnicity, in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions (more than 10 days during the school year) for children with IEPs; and (b) the number of those LEAs in which policies, procedures or practices contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If discrepancies occurred and the LEA with discrepancies had policies, procedures or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, and that do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, describe how the State ensured that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with (OSEP) Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

Targets must be 0% for 4B.

4B - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2016	0.00%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

Has the state established a minimum n/cell-size requirement? (yes/no)

YES

If yes, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, LEAs that met the State-established n/cell size. Report the number of LEAs excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.

503

Number of LEAs that have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity	Number of those LEAs that have policies, procedure or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements	Number of LEAs that met the State's minimum n/cell size	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
2	0	28	0.00%	0%	0.00%	Met target	No Slippage

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?

YES

State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology

For each LEA with at least ten discipline incidents (minimum cell size) for students with disabilities, the following ratio is calculated:

- Discipline Incident Rate for Students with Disabilities (number of incidents for students with disabilities / special education child count) compared to
- Discipline Incident Rate for Non-disabled Students (number of incidents for non-disabled students / non-disabled enrollment)

Missouri uses the same definition for "significant discrepancy" for Indicators 4A and 4B. An LEA is considered to have a significant discrepancy when the above ratio exceeds 4.0 for two consecutive years and if the average number of incidents per 100 students with disabilities is greater than 2.0 and/or the average number of incidents per 100 nondisabled students is greater than 1.0. This determination of significant discrepancies in suspension/expulsion rates, which considers a rolling two years of data, is conducted on an annual basis for every LEA in the state. Discipline incidents included in this analysis are any incidents resulting in out of school suspensions for more than ten days, both consecutive and cumulative. Multiple short suspensions summing to more than ten days are counted as a single incident for a student, in addition to any suspensions more than ten consecutive days. For example, if one student received five separate out of school suspensions of 20 days, 15 days, 8 days, 4 days, and 1 day, three counts of "suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days" would be included in the calculations: one for the 20 days, one for the 15 days, and one for 13 days (sum of 8, 4, and 1 days).

Please see additional information below which explains why the "number of districts excluded from the calculation" plus the "number of districts that met the state's minimum n-size" does not equal the total number of districts in the state.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

COVID-19 impact: The number of long-term out of school removals for students with disabilities reported for 2019-20 was approximately 33% lower than the prior school year due to COVID-19 school closures beginning in March 2020. The primary impact for this indicator is that fewer districts met the minimum n-size to be included in the analysis.

The following information describes why the "number of districts excluded from the calculation" plus the "number of districts that met the state's minimum n-size" does not equal the total number of districts in the state.

One of the service delivery options available under state statute is the creation of a special school district pursuant to Section 162.825, RSMo. The referendum of establishing a special school district creates a distinct public school district for the purpose of providing special education and related services to students with disabilities within the component districts of which it is comprised. Special School District of St. Louis County, which serves 22

component districts and Special School District of Pemiscot County, which serves seven component districts, are two such agencies in Missouri. As these special school districts have immediate responsibility for both policy development and implementation of federal IDEA Part B requirements and receive IDEA Part B dollars directly, the agencies identified and reviewed for SPP Indicators 4AB, 9, and 10 are the two "special school districts" whose data are comprised of all data from the components districts (for example, the data from the seven component districts of Pemiscot Special School District are aggregated into a single special school district). The two special school districts, along with each of the component districts, are included in the total number of LEAs included in the Introduction to the APR.

Therefore, the LEAs reported in the FFY 2019 Introduction are accounted for as follows:

- 560 LEAs reported in FFY 2019 Introduction which includes the two special school districts and the 29 component districts of the two special school districts
- Less 22 component districts of St. Louis County Special School District
- Less 7 component districts of Pemiscot Special School District
- Less 28 LEAs that met the State's minimum cell size (includes one of the special school districts)
- Results in 503 LEAs excluded from calculations due to not meeting minimum cell size (includes one of the special school districts).

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2020 using 2019-2020 data)

Provide a description of the review of policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

Data for all LEAs are reviewed annually to determine potential significant discrepancies in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs. All LEAs who meet the criteria are provided the opportunity to verify their data.

LEAs meeting criteria for significant discrepancies are subject to a review of policies, procedures, and practices relating to discipline of students with disabilities. The purpose of the reviews is to gather information to determine whether the LEA's policies, procedures, and practices related to discipline contributed to the significant discrepancy regarding discipline of students with disabilities, and to determine whether the policies, procedures, and practices comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards. This process was modified for reviews occurring during the 2018-19 school year to assist LEAs in more accurately analyzing data and identifying possible root causes relating to the significant discrepancies. The reviews occur across a three-year monitoring cycle. The first year an LEA is identified, a self-assessment is required. The second and third consecutive years an LEA is identified, a goal progress report based on the prior self-assessment is required. If an LEA is identified another consecutive year following the third year, the monitoring cycle begins again, and the LEA participates in a new self-assessment. While LEAs may review student files as a part of their self-assessment, a formal student file review will be conducted by the OSE on an as-needed basis. The OSE may determine that an onsite review is necessary at any point in the process.

The self-assessment consists of a series of questions related to policies, procedures, and practices across two topic areas (effective practices and compliance) to be answered by specific schools identified by the LEA. Based on results from the self-assessment, goals and activities are developed. The goal progress report, completed in years two and three, gives updates regarding the status of the goals and activities specified in the self-assessment.

The two LEAs identified through data analysis as having significant discrepancies in discipline rates were reviewed using monitoring procedures described above. Both completed the goal progress report and developed or updated goals and activities for improvement. In both LEAs, policies, procedures, and practices were found to be in compliance.

The State DID NOT identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
0			0

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

4B - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

4B - OSEP Response

4B- Required Actions

Indicator 5: Education Environments (children 5 (Kindergarten) - 21)

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served:

- A. Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day;
- B. Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day; and
- C. In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))

Data Source

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the IDEA, using the definitions in EDFacts file specification FS002.

Measurement

- A. Percent = $\left[\frac{\text{(\# of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served inside the regular class 80\% or more of the day)}}{\text{(total \# of students aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)}} \right] \times 100$.
- B. Percent = $\left[\frac{\text{(\# of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served inside the regular class less than 40\% of the day)}}{\text{(total \# of students aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)}} \right] \times 100$.
- C. Percent = $\left[\frac{\text{(\# of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements)}}{\text{(total \# of students aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)}} \right] \times 100$.

Instructions

Sampling from the State's 618 data is not allowed.

States must report five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in kindergarten in this indicator. Five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in preschool programs are included in Indicator 6. Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA, explain.

5 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Part	Baseline	FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
A	2019	Target >=	56.00%	56.00%	56.00%	56.00%	57.22%
A	57.22%	Data	57.59%	57.36%	57.04%	56.75%	57.22%
B	2019	Target <=	10.20%	10.20%	10.20%	10.20%	8.36%
B	8.36%	Data	8.76%	8.58%	8.45%	8.34%	8.36%
C	2019	Target <=	3.70%	3.70%	3.70%	3.65%	3.64%
C	3.64%	Data	3.61%	3.63%	3.57%	3.66%	3.64%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A >=	57.40%	57.60%	57.80%	58.00%	58.00%	58.00%
Target B <=	8.40%	8.40%	8.40%	8.30%	8.30%	8.30%
Target C <=	3.60%	3.60%	3.60%	3.60%	3.60%	3.50%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

In Missouri, the Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) serves dual roles as an advisory group to the OSE and as the primary stakeholder group for Part B compliance and services. The SEAP reviewed SPP/APR data at each of their quarterly meetings during 2021 and provided overarching recommendations on targets after reviewing the feedback received from all stakeholders on all SPP/APR indicators, including the SSIP. The SEAP was also instrumental in helping to shape the outreach efforts for broader parent input. See the Introduction for additional information on broad stakeholder engagement.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/07/2021	Total number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21	115,909

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/07/2021	A. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	66,987
SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/07/2021	B. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	9,363
SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/07/2021	c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in separate schools	3,463
SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/07/2021	c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in residential facilities	3
SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/07/2021	c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in homebound/hospital placements	640

Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.

NO

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

Education Environments	Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	66,987	115,909	57.22%	57.40%	57.79%	Met target	No Slippage
B. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	9,363	115,909	8.36%	8.40%	8.08%	Met target	No Slippage
C. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3]	4,106	115,909	3.64%	3.60%	3.54%	Met target	No Slippage

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

COVID Impact: Overall school-age special education child count was down approximately 3.5 percent from 2019-20, presumably due to COVID-19 related decisions to limit exposure in schools.

5 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

5 - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

5 - Required Actions

Indicator 6: Preschool Environments

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of children with IEPs aged 3, 4, and aged 5 who are enrolled in a preschool program attending a:

- A. Regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and
- B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.
- C. Receiving special education and related services in the home.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))

Data Source

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the IDEA, using the definitions in EDFacts file specification FS089.

Measurement

- A. Percent = $\left[\frac{\text{(\# of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program)}}{\text{(total \# of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs)}} \right] \times 100$.
- B. Percent = $\left[\frac{\text{(\# of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility)}}{\text{(total \# of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs)}} \right] \times 100$.
- C. Percent = $\left[\frac{\text{(\# of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs receiving special education and related services in the home)}}{\text{(total \# of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs)}} \right] \times 100$.

Instructions

Sampling from the State's 618 data is not allowed.

States must report five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in preschool programs in this indicator. Five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in kindergarten are included in Indicator 5.

States may choose to set one target that is inclusive of children ages 3, 4, and 5, or set individual targets for each age.

For Indicator 6C: States are not required to establish a baseline or targets if the number of children receiving special education and related services in the home is less than 10, regardless of whether the State chooses to set one target that is inclusive of children ages 3, 4, and 5, or set individual targets for each age. In a reporting period during which the number of children receiving special education and related services in the home reaches 10 or greater, States are required to develop baseline and targets and report on them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

For Indicator 6C: States may express their targets in a range (e.g., 75-85%). Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under IDEA section 618, explain.

6 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data – 6A, 6B

Part	FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
A	Target >=	31.00%	32.00%	33.00%	47.30%	27.13%
A	Data	44.19%	43.53%	43.62%	43.89%	27.13%
B	Target <=	30.00%	29.00%	28.00%	22.80%	37.48%
B	Data	25.02%	24.57%	24.96%	26.05%	37.48%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

In Missouri, the Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) serves dual roles as an advisory group to the OSE and as the primary stakeholder group for Part B compliance and services. The SEAP reviewed SPP/APR data at each of their quarterly meetings during 2021 and provided overarching recommendations on targets after reviewing the feedback received from all stakeholders on all SPP/APR indicators, including the SSIP. The SEAP was also instrumental in helping to shape the outreach efforts for broader parent input. See the Introduction for additional information on broad stakeholder engagement.

For Indicator 6C, the SEAP recommended setting targets for all years (including the final year) above the baseline due to the large number of small LEAs in the state where one or two children whose parents did not want to enroll their children in an early childhood program would cause the LEA's 6C percent to be higher than the statewide baseline of 2.85 percent. With more than 500 LEAs in Missouri and only 289 children reported with an educational environment of Home, stakeholders understood that even one child in the Home category could result in a larger than average (compared to statewide) percent of children in that category. Stakeholders felt that the final decision to enroll or not enroll a child in an early childhood program belongs to the parents, and LEAs should not be driven by a "quota" defined by a state target.

Targets

Please select if the State wants to set baseline and targets based on individual age ranges (i.e. separate baseline and targets for each age), or inclusive of all children ages 3, 4, and 5.

Inclusive Targets

Please select if the State wants to use target ranges for 6C.

Target Range not used

Baselines for Inclusive Targets option (A, B, C)

Part	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
A	2019	27.13%
B	2019	37.48%
C	2020	2.85%

Inclusive Targets – 6A, 6B

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A >=	24.58%	25.00%	25.00%	27.00%	29.00%	31.00%
Target B <=	41.91%	40.00%	38.00%	36.00%	34.00%	32.00%

Inclusive Targets – 6C

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target C <=	5.00%	5.00%	5.00%	5.00%	5.00%	5.00%

Prepopulated Data

Data Source:

SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)

Date:

07/07/2021

Description	3	4	5	3 through 5 - Total
Total number of children with IEPs	2,866	5,142	2,147	10,155
a1. Number of children attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	654	1,242	600	2,496
b1. Number of children attending separate special education class	1,403	1,991	728	4,122
b2. Number of children attending separate school	39	73	22	134
b3. Number of children attending residential facility	0	0	0	0
c1. Number of children receiving special education and related services in the home	77	158	54	289

Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.

NO

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data - Aged 3 through 5

Preschool Environments	Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A. A regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	2,496	10,155	27.13%	24.58%	24.58%	Met target	No Slippage
B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility	4,256	10,155	37.48%	41.91%	41.91%	Met target	No Slippage
C. Home	289	10,155		5.00%	2.85%	N/A	N/A

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

COVID Impact: Overall early childhood special education child count was down approximately 20 percent from 2019-20, presumably due to COVID-19 related decisions to not send preschool children to group programs in order to limit exposure. While more children than usual were reported in the Home category, the statewide total was still very low at 2.85 percent.

6 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

6 - OSEP Response

The State has established a baseline for Indicator B6C, using data from FFY 2020, and OSEP accepts that baseline.

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

6 - Required Actions

Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved:

- A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);
- B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication and early literacy); and
- C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Data Source

State selected data source.

Measurement

Outcomes:

- A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);
- B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy); and
- C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

Progress categories for A, B and C:

- a. Percent of preschool children who did not improve functioning = [(# of preschool children who did not improve functioning) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.
- b. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.
- c. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.
- d. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.
- e. Percent of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.

Summary Statements for Each of the Three Outcomes:

Summary Statement 1: Of those preschool children who entered the preschool program below age expectations in each Outcome, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.

Measurement for Summary Statement 1: Percent = [(# of preschool children reported in progress category (c) plus # of preschool children reported in category (d)) divided by ((# of preschool children reported in progress category (a) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (b) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (c) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (d))] times 100.

Summary Statement 2: The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in each Outcome by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.

Measurement for Summary Statement 2: Percent = [(# of preschool children reported in progress category (d) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (e)) divided by ((the total # of preschool children reported in progress categories (a) + (b) + (c) + (d) + (e))] times 100.

Instructions

Sampling of **children for assessment** is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates. (See [General Instructions](#) on page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)

In the measurement include, in the numerator and denominator, only children who received special education and related services for at least six months during the age span of three through five years.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. States will use the progress categories for each of the three Outcomes to calculate and report the two Summary Statements. States have provided targets for the two Summary Statements for the three Outcomes (six numbers for targets for each FFY).

Report progress data and calculate Summary Statements to compare against the six targets. Provide the actual numbers and percentages for the five reporting categories for each of the three outcomes.

In presenting results, provide the criteria for defining "comparable to same-aged peers." If a State is using the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary (COS), then the criteria for defining "comparable to same-aged peers" has been defined as a child who has been assigned a score of 6 or 7 on the COS.

In addition, list the instruments and procedures used to gather data for this indicator, including if the State is using the ECO COS.

7 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Part	Baseline	FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
A1	2013	Target >=	92.70%	92.70%	92.70%	93.90%	93.90%
A1	93.83%	Data	94.98%	95.80%	95.69%	95.88%	95.86%
A2	2020	Target >=	45.00%	45.00%	45.00%	48.20%	48.20%

A2	33.28%	Data	47.16%	44.84%	42.16%	42.17%	36.54%
B1	2013	Target >=	93.80%	93.80%	93.80%	95.50%	95.50%
B1	95.48%	Data	96.35%	96.95%	96.16%	96.85%	96.63%
B2	2020	Target >=	37.00%	37.00%	37.00%	40.60%	40.60%
B2	30.21%	Data	38.89%	38.71%	37.00%	36.39%	33.21%
C1	2013	Target >=	90.70%	90.70%	90.70%	93.50%	93.50%
C1	93.48%	Data	95.23%	95.42%	95.51%	95.96%	96.19%
C2	2020	Target >=	53.00%	53.00%	53.00%	56.90%	56.90%
C2	40.37%	Data	56.86%	54.28%	52.17%	51.50%	46.30%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A1 >=	94.00%	94.00%	94.00%	94.00%	94.00%	94.00%
Target A2 >=	33.28%	32.00%	32.00%	32.50%	33.00%	33.50%
Target B1 >=	95.50%	95.50%	95.50%	95.50%	95.50%	95.50%
Target B2 >=	30.21%	29.00%	29.00%	29.50%	30.00%	30.50%
Target C1 >=	93.50%	93.50%	93.50%	93.50%	93.50%	93.50%
Target C2 >=	40.37%	39.00%	39.00%	39.50%	40.00%	40.50%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

In Missouri, the Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) serves dual roles as an advisory group to the OSE and as the primary stakeholder group for Part B compliance and services. The SEAP reviewed SPP/APR data at each of their quarterly meetings during 2021 and provided overarching recommendations on targets after reviewing the feedback received from all stakeholders on all SPP/APR indicators, including the SSIP. The SEAP was also instrumental in helping to shape the outreach efforts for broader parent input. See the Introduction for additional information on broad stakeholder engagement.

Baseline year change justification for Summary Statement 2: The baseline year for Summary Statement 2 in each of the three outcome areas is being changed to FFY 2020. Summary Statement 2 is the percentage of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations when they exited early childhood special education (ECSE). Actual data for Summary Statement 2 has been steadily decreasing for many years, with the decreases attributable to better data quality. The recent and lower percentages for Summary Statement 2 better align with the fact that in Missouri, approximately 80 percent of children in ECSE continue to qualify for special education services in kindergarten. The prior FFY 2013 baseline was inconsistent with the high levels of continuing special education eligibility in the state, and therefore was not accurately reflecting children's status when exiting ECSE. Technical assistance has promoted a better understanding of the Early Childhood Outcomes (ECO) rating process over the years, and the state is currently updating professional development on ECO which is likely to continue the historical decreases for Summary Statement 2 due to a better understanding of age anchoring and the meaning of the ratings. The professional development updates are being facilitated by a data quality workgroup sponsored by the The Center for IDEA Early Childhood Data Systems (DaSy) and the Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center (ECTA).

The SEAP supports this baseline year change, indicating that it will give LEAs a more reasonable baseline from which to make improvements.

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

Number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed

4,429

Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)

Outcome A Progress Category	Number of children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	87	1.96%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	96	2.17%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	2,772	62.59%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,151	25.99%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	323	7.29%

Outcome A	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)</i>	3,923	4,106	95.86%	94.00%	95.54%	Met target	No Slippage
A2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)</i>	1,474	4,429	36.54%	33.28%	33.28%	N/A	N/A

Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication)

Outcome B Progress Category	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	75	1.69%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	72	1.63%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	2,944	66.47%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,194	26.96%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	144	3.25%

Outcome B	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
B1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)</i>	4,138	4,285	96.63%	95.50%	96.57%	Met target	No Slippage
B2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)</i>	1,338	4,429	33.21%	30.21%	30.21%	N/A	N/A

Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs

Outcome C Progress Category	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	91	2.05%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	75	1.69%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	2,475	55.88%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,409	31.81%

Outcome C Progress Category	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	379	8.56%

Outcome C	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
C1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)</i>	3,884	4,050	96.19%	93.50%	95.90%	Met target	No Slippage
C2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)</i>	1,788	4,429	46.30%	40.37%	40.37%	N/A	N/A

Does the State include in the numerator and denominator only children who received special education and related services for at least six months during the age span of three through five years? (yes/no)

YES

Sampling Question	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO

Did you use the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary Form (COS) process? (yes/no)

NO

If no, provide the criteria for defining "comparable to same-aged peers."

Based on the ratings determined at entry and exit by ECSE personnel, "comparable to same-aged peers" is defined as a rating of "5" on a scale of 1–5, meaning "completely (all of the time/typical)" in response to the question "To what extent does this child show age-appropriate functioning, across a variety of settings and situations?" A rating of "5" roughly translates to a 0–10% delay.

List the instruments and procedures used to gather data for this indicator.

ECSE personnel use multiple sources of information rather than a single approved assessment instrument to gather data for this indicator. Therefore, an approved list of instruments has not been compiled. However, the state of Missouri conducted a pilot of several early childhood assessment instruments with the intent of arriving at a more uniform assessment profile across the state for all students, including students with disabilities. In June 2013, the State Board of Education adopted the Desired Results Developmental Profile (DRDP) as the recommended instrument to be used as an Early Childhood Readiness Assessment Tool for all early childhood programs in the state. During the 2013-14 school year, training began for ECSE staff in the administration of this assessment. Some ECSE programs began voluntary usage of the assessment as the ECO data collection tool during the 2014-15 school year. The DRDP continues to be the recommended Early Childhood Readiness Assessment Tool, but the number of LEAs using this instrument is unknown.

Regardless of the instruments used, a handout with definitions of the ECO ratings, a Decision Tree for ECO Ratings, and the Missouri Outcomes Summary Sheet (MOSS) are available to assist ECSE personnel in synthesizing information into a comprehensive summary. The definitions and Decision Tree are technical assistance documents that assist ECSE personnel in reviewing the assessment results and determining an appropriate ECO rating. The MOSS can be used to synthesize information from multiple sources. All of these documents are located at <https://dese.mo.gov/childhood/quality-programs/preschool-programs/early-childhood-special-education/early-childhood-outcomes-training>

No sampling is used for gathering ECO data. All children with potential of being in the program for six months or more are assessed. Entry and exit data must be determined within 30 days of eligibility determination and exit from the program, respectively. A rating of 1–5 is determined for each of the three outcome indicators with 1 meaning "Not Yet" and 5 meaning "Completely." All entry and exit data collected during a given year is submitted electronically to DESE at the end of that school year. The outcome status for each child is determined by comparing the entry and exit ratings.

More information can be obtained at <https://dese.mo.gov/childhood/quality-programs/preschool-programs/early-childhood-special-education/early-childhood-outcomes-training>

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

COVID-19 Impact: Data collection for this indicator was not impacted by COVID-19.

7 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

7 - OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2020 for sub-indicators A2, B2, and C2, and OSEP accepts those revisions, however, OSEP would expect that all summary statements would use a consistent baseline year.

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

7 - Required Actions

The State has provided baselines using data from FFY 2013 for A1, B1, and C1, and using data from FFY 2020 for A2, B2, and C2. In the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the State must revise baselines to use data from the same year across summary statements, and with stakeholder input, revise any targets as appropriate to ensure the FFY 2025 targets reflect improvement over baseline.

Indicator 8: Parent involvement

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))

Data Source

State selected data source.

Measurement

Percent = [(# of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities) divided by the (total # of respondent parents of children with disabilities)] times 100.

Instructions

Sampling of parents from whom response is requested is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates. (See [General Instructions](#) on page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

If the State is using a separate data collection methodology for preschool children, the State must provide separate baseline data, targets, and actual target data or discuss the procedures used to combine data from school age and preschool data collection methodologies in a manner that is valid and reliable.

While a survey is not required for this indicator, a State using a survey must submit a copy of any new or revised survey with its SPP/APR.

Report the number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed and the number of respondent parents. The survey response rate is automatically calculated using the submitted data.

States must compare the response rate for the reporting year to the response rate for the previous year (e.g., in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, compare the FFY 2020 response rate to the FFY 2019 response rate) and describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

The State must also analyze the response rate to identify potential nonresponse bias and take steps to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of parents of children with disabilities.

Include in the State's analysis the extent to which the demographics of the children for whom parents responded are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. States should consider categories such as race/ethnicity, age of student, disability category, and geographic location in the State.

States must describe the metric used to determine representativeness (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group).

If the analysis shows that the demographics of the children for whom parents responding are not representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services in the State, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics. In identifying such strategies, the State should consider factors such as how the State distributed the survey to parents (e.g., by mail, by e-mail, on-line, by telephone, in-person through school personnel), and how responses were collected.

Beginning with the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2023, when reporting the extent to which the demographics of the children for whom parents responded are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services, States must include race/ethnicity in their analysis. In addition, the State's analysis must also include at least one of the following demographics: age of the student, disability category, gender, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process.

States are encouraged to work in collaboration with their OSEP-funded parent centers in collecting data.

8 - Indicator Data

Question	Yes / No
Do you use a separate data collection methodology for preschool children?	NO

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

In Missouri, the Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) serves dual roles as an advisory group to the OSE and as the primary stakeholder group for Part B compliance and services. The SEAP reviewed SPP/APR data at each of their quarterly meetings during 2021 and provided overarching recommendations on targets after reviewing the feedback received from all stakeholders on all SPP/APR indicators, including the SSIP. The SEAP was also instrumental in helping to shape the outreach efforts for broader parent input. See the Introduction for additional information on broad stakeholder engagement.

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2006	69.40%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target >=	70.00%	70.00%	70.00%	70.00%	70.00%
Data	75.65%	72.71%	74.41%	75.62%	76.58%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=	73.00%	73.00%	73.00%	77.00%	77.00%	77.00%

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

Number of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities	Total number of respondent parents of children with disabilities	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
4,271	5,810	76.58%	73.00%	73.51%	Met target	No Slippage

Since the State did not report preschool children separately, discuss the procedures used to combine data from school age and preschool surveys in a manner that is valid and reliable.

DESE uses a single survey for all students with disabilities. LEAs are instructed to disseminate the survey to parents of all students with disabilities, including preschool students.

Data reported above includes responses from both school age and preschool parent respondents. Approximately 10.2% of the respondents were parents of preschoolers.

The number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed.

36,411

Percentage of respondent parents

15.96%

Response Rate

FFY	2019	2020
Response Rate	10.72%	15.96%

Describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate year over year, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

The FFY 2019 response rate was lower than usual, most likely due to COVID-19. The FFY 2020 response rate was the highest in recent years, in part due to follow-up procedures used by the OSE. The OSE reviews response rate data on LEAs throughout the survey period. LEAs with low response rates are contacted at least twice during the survey period by the OSE Compliance section.

Race/ethnicity was added to the parent survey for the 2020-21 school year. Potential under-representation of racial/ethnic groups will be addressed through additional follow-up for LEAs for the 2021-22 survey, as well as through increased publicity of the family survey through Missouri's PTI, MPACT.

Describe the analysis of the response rate including any nonresponse bias that was identified, and the steps taken to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of parents of children with disabilities.

The 2021 Parent Survey was comprised of ten main statements with responses on a five-point Likert scale, from Strongly Disagree (1) to Strongly Agree (5). The survey was conducted and data collected by the Institute of Public Policy at the University of Missouri. The survey was sent to the 183 LEAs (cohort) that were conducting self-assessments for monitoring purposes.

Each cohort includes approximately one-third of the LEAs in the state (including public charter schools and other public agencies responsible for provision of educational services). LEAs in each cohort were selected based on size within each region and across the state. This assures an equal distribution of the LEAs in each of the cohorts. Each cohort has equal representation of large, medium, and small LEAs from urban, suburban, and rural settings. Each cohort also represents the variety of socio-economic and racial/ethnic populations found in the state.

The monitoring cohort surveyed during the 2020-21 school year included 183 LEAs. Responses were received from 176 LEAs (96% LEA response rate), which represented over 99% of the students with disabilities in the cohort's LEAs. A total of 5,891 surveys were completed, 25% by mail and 75% electronically. The return rate for 2020-21 was 16.2%, the highest response rate in recent years. The mean LEA response rate was 25.9%; the median LEA response rate was 23.1%. Of the seven LEAs that did not have any survey responses, one was the Department of Corrections and five had fewer than 40 students with disabilities. Note that while 5,891 surveys were completed, only 5,810 responded to the items used for Indicator 8, resulting in the 15.96% return rate calculated by the system.

The state began collecting racial/ethnic data for the 2020-21 parent survey. In this first year, the racial/ethnic data were not available on an on-going basis in order to target districts with low minority response rates for additional follow-up. This additional data review will be implemented for the 2021-22 survey process.

Nonresponse bias was analyzed by comparing survey responses for racial/ethnic populations that were underrepresented to other populations. Two survey items showed statistically significant differences between groups, but the data for Indicator 8 did not show differences between racial/ethnic groups. This suggests that there is very limited nonresponse bias due to lower response rates for Black and Hispanic populations.

This is supported by the fact that the parent survey and its data collection process is designed to minimize nonresponse bias. The survey itself was

designed with assistance of the University of Missouri Institute of Public Policy which should minimize nonresponse due to poor survey design. Also, Missouri's survey is fairly short and requires minimal time and effort to complete and submit. The process used to disseminate surveys to all parents within the cohort of LEAs by requiring the LEAs to disseminate the surveys, and providing both electronic and paper options for returning the surveys should minimize nonresponse bias. Finally, the data collection period is extended as needed in order to gather as many responses as possible.

Include in the State's analysis the extent to which the demographics of the children for whom parents responded are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. States should consider categories such as race/ethnicity, age of student, disability category, and geographic location in the State.

In order to determine representativeness of the data, respondents' geographic location was examined via RPDC areas. The response rates were similar across regions, with slightly smaller than expected percentages of responses from the St. Louis (24.4% of child count and 18.9% of responses) and Kansas City (22.5% of child count and 19.1% of parent responses) regions due to several larger LEAs in those regions that had lower than average response rates.

"Age of student" was also examined via the school types of Preschool, Elementary, and Secondary. The data indicated that responses by school type (proxy for age of student) are representative of the state since the percent of responses was within 5% of the percent of child count for each school type.

Race/ethnicity was added to the parent survey for the 2020-21 school year. Data analysis indicates slight under-representation of Black parents (14.5% of child count in the surveyed cohort and 9.3% of survey responses) and Hispanic parents (7.1% of child count in the surveyed cohort and 3.3% of survey responses) although a slight over-representation of multi-racial parents (5.6% of child count in the surveyed cohort and 7.6% of survey responses) could offset the discrepancy if the race/ethnicity reported on the survey was different than the student race/ethnicity.

In summary, the review of data by geographic location, age of student, and race/ethnicity indicates that the children of respondents are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services.

The demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. (yes/no)

YES

If no, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics.

Describe the metric used to determine representativeness (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group).

+/- 6% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group

Sampling Question	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO

Survey Question	Yes / No
Was a survey used?	YES
If yes, is it a new or revised survey?	NO
If yes, provide a copy of the survey.	

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

COVID-19 Impact: Data collection for this indicator was not impacted by COVID-19.

8 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

8 - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

8 - Required Actions

Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representation

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality

Compliance indicator: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(C))

Data Source

State's analysis, based on State's Child Count data collected under IDEA section 618, to determine if the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification.

Measurement

Percent = [(# of districts, that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups, with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification) divided by the (# of districts in the State that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups)] times 100.

Include State's definition of "disproportionate representation." Please specify in your definition: 1) the calculation method(s) being used (i.e., risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, e-formula, etc.); and 2) the threshold at which disproportionate representation is identified. Also include, as appropriate, 3) the number of years of data used in the calculation; and 4) any minimum cell and/or n-sizes (i.e., risk numerator and/or risk denominator).

Based on its review of the 618 data for the reporting year, describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification as required by 34 CFR §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a), e.g., using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures, etc. In determining disproportionate representation, analyze data, for each district, for all racial and ethnic groups in the district, or all racial and ethnic groups in the district that meet a minimum n and/or cell size set by the State. Report on the percent of districts in which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2020 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2021).

Instructions

Provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and 6 through 21 served under IDEA, aggregated across all disability categories.

States are not required to report on underrepresentation.

If the State has established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met that State-established n and/or cell size. If the State used a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, report the number of districts totally excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement because the district did not meet the minimum n and/or cell size for any racial/ethnic group.

Consider using multiple methods in calculating disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups to reduce the risk of overlooking potential problems. Describe the method(s) used to calculate disproportionate representation.

Provide the number of districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services and the number of those districts identified with disproportionate representation that is the result of inappropriate identification.

Targets must be 0%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken. If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

9 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2020	0.00%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

Has the state established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement? (yes/no)

YES

If yes, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size. Report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.

405

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in special education and related services	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	Number of districts that met the State's minimum n and/or cell size	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
0	0	126	0.00%	0%	0.00%	N/A	N/A

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?

YES

Define “disproportionate representation.” Please specify in your definition: 1) the calculation method(s) being used (i.e., risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, e-formula, etc.); and 2) the threshold at which disproportionate representation is identified. Also include, as appropriate, 3) the number of years of data used in the calculation; and 4) any minimum cell and/or n-sizes (i.e., risk numerator and/or risk denominator).

The state's identification method for disproportionate representation uses a rolling two-year approach and examines risk ratios and cell sizes for all racial/ethnic groups. For the special education total and by disability category (using state-reported Section 618 data), risk ratios are computed for every racial/ethnic group. The definition of disproportionate representation is a risk ratio greater than 2.5 for two consecutive years, along with a minimum cell size of 20 students with disabilities in the racial/ethnic group being considered as well as in the comparison group (all other racial/ethnic groups) for each of the two years. Unique LEA characteristics are also considered so that LEAs are not identified as having disproportionate representation if the data are solely due to group homes or treatment centers where students are publicly placed in the LEA boundaries or other similar situations.

Please see additional information below which explains why the “number of districts excluded from the calculation” plus the “number of districts that met the state's minimum n-size” does not equal the total number of districts in the state.

Describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification.

When an LEA is identified as having disproportionate representation, the OSE reviews the LEA's policies, procedures, and practices for identification to determine if the disproportionate representation is the result of inappropriate identification. The process for this review was modified for reviews occurring during the 2018-19 school year to assist LEAs in more accurately analyzing data and identifying possible root causes relating to the disproportionate representation. The reviews occur across a three-year monitoring cycle. The first year an LEA is identified, a self-assessment is required. The second and third consecutive years an LEA is identified, a goal progress report based on the prior self-assessment is required. If an LEA is identified another consecutive year following the third year, the monitoring cycle begins again, and the LEA participates in a new self-assessment. While LEAs may review student files as a part of their self-assessment, a formal student file review will be conducted by the OSE on an as-needed basis. In addition, the OSE may determine that an onsite review is necessary at any point in the process.

The self-assessment consists of a series of questions related to policies, procedures, and practices across two topic areas (effective practices and compliance) to be answered by specific schools identified by the LEA. Based on the results of the self-assessment, goals and activities are developed. The goal progress report, completed in years two and three, gives updates regarding the status of the goals and activities specified in the self-assessment.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Data collection for this indicator was not impacted by COVID-19.

The following information describes why the “number of districts excluded from the calculation” plus the “number of districts that met the state's minimum n-size” does not equal the total number of districts in the state.

One of the service delivery options available under state statute is the creation of a special school district pursuant to Section 162.825, RSMo. The referendum of establishing a special school district creates a distinct public school district for the purpose of providing special education and related services to students with disabilities within the component districts of which it is comprised. Special School District of St. Louis County, which serves 22 component districts and Special School District of Pemiscot County, which serves seven component districts, are two such agencies in Missouri. As these special school districts have immediate responsibility for both policy development and implementation of federal IDEA Part B requirements and receive IDEA Part B dollars directly, the agencies identified and reviewed for SPP Indicators 4AB, 9, and 10 are the two “special school districts” whose data are comprised of all data from the component districts (for example, the data from the seven component districts of Pemiscot Special School District are aggregated into a single special school district). The two special school districts, along with each of the component districts, are included in the total number of LEAs included in the Introduction to the APR.

Therefore, the LEAs reported in the FFY 2020 Introduction are accounted for as follows:

- 560 LEAs reported in FFY 2020 Introduction which includes the two special school districts and the 29 component districts of the two special school districts
- Less 22 component districts of St. Louis County Special School District
- Less 7 component districts of Pemiscot Special School District
- Less 126 LEAs that met the State's minimum cell size (includes the two special school districts)
- Results in 405 LEAs excluded from calculations due to not meeting minimum cell size.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
0			0

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

9 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

9 - OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2020, and OSEP accepts that revision.

9 - Required Actions

Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representation in Specific Disability Categories

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality

Compliance indicator: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(C))

Data Source

State's analysis, based on State's Child Count data collected under IDEA section 618, to determine if the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification.

Measurement

Percent = [(# of districts, that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups, with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification) divided by the (# of districts in the State that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups)] times 100.

Include State's definition of "disproportionate representation." Please specify in your definition: 1) the calculation method(s) being used (i.e., risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, e-formula, etc.); and 2) the threshold at which disproportionate representation is identified. Also include, as appropriate, 3) the number of years of data used in the calculation; and 4) any minimum cell and/or n-sizes (i.e., risk numerator and/or risk denominator).

Based on its review of the 618 data for FFY 2020, describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification as required by 34 CFR §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a), e.g., using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures, etc. In determining disproportionate representation, analyze data, for each district, for all racial and ethnic groups in the district, or all racial and ethnic groups in the district that meet a minimum n and/or cell size set by the State. Report on the percent of districts in which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2020 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2021).

Instructions

Provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served under IDEA. Provide these data at a minimum for children in the following six disability categories: intellectual disability, specific learning disabilities, emotional disturbance, speech or language impairments, other health impairments, and autism. If a State has identified disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories other than these six disability categories, the State must include these data and report on whether the State determined that the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification.

States are not required to report on underrepresentation.

If the State has established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met that State-established n and/or cell size. If the State used a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, report the number of districts totally excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement because the district did not meet the minimum n and/or cell size for any racial/ethnic group.

Consider using multiple methods in calculating disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups to reduce the risk of overlooking potential problems. Describe the method(s) used to calculate disproportionate representation.

Provide the number of districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories and the number of those districts identified with disproportionate representation that is the result of inappropriate identification.

Targets must be 0%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

10 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2020	0.00%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

Has the state established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement? (yes/no)

YES

If yes, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size. Report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.

471

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in specific disability categories	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	Number of districts that met the State's minimum n and/or cell size	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
6	0	60	0.00%	0%	0.00%	N/A	N/A

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?

YES

Define “disproportionate representation.” Please specify in your definition: 1) the calculation method(s) being used (i.e., risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, e-formula, etc.); and 2) the threshold at which disproportionate representation is identified. Also include, as appropriate, 3) the number of years of data used in the calculation; and 4) any minimum cell and/or n-sizes (i.e., risk numerator and/or risk denominator).

The state’s identification method for disproportionate representation uses a rolling two-year approach and examines risk ratios and cell sizes for all racial/ethnic groups. For the special education total and by disability category (using state-reported Section 618 data), risk ratios are computed for every racial/ethnic group. The definition of disproportionate representation is a risk ratio greater than 2.5 for two consecutive years, along with a minimum cell size of 20 students with disabilities in the racial/ethnic group being considered as well as in the comparison group (all other racial/ethnic groups) for each of the two years. Unique LEA characteristics are also considered so that LEAs are not identified as having disproportionate representation if the data are solely due to group homes or treatment centers where students are publicly placed in the LEA boundaries or other similar situations.

Please see additional information below which explains why the “number of districts excluded from the calculation” plus the “number of districts that met the state’s minimum n-size” does not equal the total number of districts in the state.

Describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate overrepresentation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification.

When an LEA is identified as having disproportionate representation, the OSE reviews the LEA’s policies, procedures, and practices for identification to determine if the disproportionate representation is the result of inappropriate identification. The process for this review was modified for reviews occurring during the 2018-19 school year to assist LEAs in more accurately analyzing data and identifying possible root causes relating to the disproportionate representation. The reviews occur across a three-year monitoring cycle. The first year an LEA is identified, a self-assessment is required. The second and third consecutive years an LEA is identified, a goal progress report based on the prior self-assessment is required. If an LEA is identified another consecutive year following the third year, the monitoring cycle begins again, and the LEA participates in a new self-assessment. While LEAs may review student files as a part of their self-assessment, a formal student file review will be conducted by the OSE on an as-needed basis. In addition, the OSE may determine that an onsite review is necessary at any point in the process.

The self-assessment consists of a series of questions related to policies, procedures, and practices across two topic areas (effective practices and compliance) to be answered by specific schools identified by the LEA. Based on the results of the self-assessment, goals and activities are developed. The goal progress report, completed in years two and three, gives updates regarding the status of the goals and activities specified in the self-assessment.

The six LEAs identified through data analysis as having disproportionate representation were reviewed using monitoring procedures described above. All completed the self-assessment and developed goals and activities for improvement or provided a goal/progress report. In all six LEAs, policies, procedures, and practices were found not to result in inappropriate identification.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Data collection for this indicator was not impacted by COVID-19.

The following information describes why the “number of districts excluded from the calculation” plus the “number of districts that met the state’s minimum n-size” does not equal the total number of districts in the state.

One of the service delivery options available under state statute is the creation of a special school district pursuant to Section 162.825, RSMo. The referendum of establishing a special school district creates a distinct public school district for the purpose of providing special education and related services to students with disabilities within the component districts of which it is comprised. Special School District of St. Louis County, which serves 22 component districts and Special School District of Pemiscot County, which serves seven component districts, are two such agencies in Missouri. As these special school districts have immediate responsibility for both policy development and implementation of federal IDEA Part B requirements and receive IDEA Part B dollars directly, the agencies identified and reviewed for SPP Indicators 4AB, 9, and 10 are the two “special school districts” whose data are comprised of all data from the components districts (for example, the data from the seven component districts of Pemiscot Special School

District are aggregated into a single special school district). The two special school districts, along with each of the component districts, are included in the total number of LEAs included in the Introduction to the APR.

Therefore, the LEAs reported in the FFY 2020 Introduction are accounted for as follows:

- 560 LEAs reported in FFY 2020 Introduction which includes the two special school districts the 29 component districts of the two special school districts
- Less 22 component districts of St. Louis County Special School District
- Less 7 component districts of Pemiscot Special School District
- Less 60 LEAs that met the State's minimum cell size (includes the two special school districts)
- Results in 471 LEAs excluded from calculations due to not meeting minimum cell size.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
0			0

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

10 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

10 - OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2020, and OSEP accepts that revision.

10 - Required Actions

Indicator 11: Child Find

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Child Find

Compliance indicator: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Data Source

Data to be taken from State monitoring or State data system and must be based on actual, not an average, number of days. Indicate if the State has established a timeline and, if so, what is the State's timeline for initial evaluations.

Measurement

- a. # of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received.
 - b. # of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State-established timeline).
- Account for children included in (a), but not included in (b). Indicate the range of days beyond the timeline when the evaluation was completed and any reasons for the delays.

Percent = [(b) divided by (a)] times 100.

Instructions

If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select LEAs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, include data for the entire reporting year.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Note that under 34 CFR §300.301(d), the timeframe set for initial evaluation does not apply to a public agency if: (1) the parent of a child repeatedly fails or refuses to produce the child for the evaluation; or (2) a child enrolls in a school of another public agency after the timeframe for initial evaluations has begun, and prior to a determination by the child's previous public agency as to whether the child is a child with a disability. States should not report these exceptions in either the numerator (b) or denominator (a). If the State-established timeframe provides for exceptions through State regulation or policy, describe cases falling within those exceptions and include in b.

Targets must be 100%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

11 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	94.70%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	98.81%	99.46%	99.09%	99.01%	99.17%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

(a) Number of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received	(b) Number of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State-established timeline)	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
4,844	4,768	99.17%	100%	98.43%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Number of children included in (a) but not included in (b)

76

Account for children included in (a) but not included in (b). Indicate the range of days beyond the timeline when the evaluation was completed and any reasons for the delays.

Delays for the 76 children ranged from six days to 124 days. The longest delays were due in part to student absences, COVID-19 related quarantines, school breaks, and the inability to contact parents. These reasons all resulted in the child being unavailable for testing and therefore were considered acceptable extensions to the timelines, however the reasons did not fully explain the total delay and the LEAs were cited for noncompliance with the timelines. A small number of delays were due to delays in completion of evaluations, some due to COVID-19 related staffing availability issues. Several of the unacceptable delays cited COVID-19 issues as a contributing factor to the delays.

Most timelines deemed unacceptable included valid extensions that did not cover the entire amount of delay (i.e., delay was ten days, but only six of those days had acceptable reasons); delayed evaluation reports; or parents cancelling or rescheduling eligibility meetings.

Regarding COVID-19, LEAs were expected to provide educational services to all students and to continue with evaluations. LEAs were reminded that timelines could be extended because a child was not available for testing, but not simply because instruction was occurring via remote/virtual means. LEAs needed to document good faith efforts to work with parents to complete assessments if the student was not sick or quarantined.

Indicate the evaluation timeline used:

The State established a timeline within which the evaluation must be conducted

What is the State's timeline for initial evaluations? If the State-established timeframe provides for exceptions through State regulation or policy, describe cases falling within those exceptions and include in (b).

The state uses a 60-day timeline for initial evaluations but allows the following as reasons for extending the evaluation timelines:

- Snow days or other school closures due to inclement weather (per State Regulation)
- Agency vacation days (per State Regulation)
- Child's absence because of illness (per State Regulation)
- Summer break (per State Regulation)
- Parent refuses/fails to produce child (per 300.301(d))
- Change in district of enrollment during evaluation process (per 300.301(d))

What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?

State monitoring

Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data.

Data for this indicator are gathered in the web-based system, IMACS, which is used by LEAs to enter monitoring self-assessment information, including a list of children for whom an initial evaluation was conducted. The special education monitoring cycle is part of a three-year cohort process, and approximately one-third of all LEAs are reviewed each year. Each of the three cohorts is representative of the state and includes LEAs in all regions of the state.

LEAs enter the following information for each student referred for initial evaluation during the reporting period:

- Student's name
- Date of parental consent to evaluate
- Date of eligibility
- Student eligible (Y/N)
- Eligibility determined in 60 days (calculated Y/N)
- If No, reason for delay
- Acceptable reason (Y/N)

The information is reviewed and verified by OSE Compliance staff during the desk review of the self-assessment data. The desk review process includes checking the 60-day evaluation timeline information by using a calendar system. If the LEAs include initial evaluation timelines which are not within 60 days, the criteria listed above are accepted as reasons for extending the evaluation timelines. Delays are considered out of compliance if the reasons for the extensions do not meet the established acceptable criteria or if the LEA fails to provide a reason for the extension of the timeline.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

COVID-19 Impact: Data collection for this indicator was not impacted by COVID-19.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
75	75	0	0

FFY 2019 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

Timeline data are submitted by the LEAs in the monitoring cohort to DESE in May each year. As described above, the data includes pertinent dates and explanations for exceeding timelines if necessary, but the data are not considered noncompliant until verification by OSE staff has been completed. Between May and August, OSE compliance staff request any necessary documentation from the LEAs in order to verify whether delays are due to acceptable reasons.

Final reports are issued to LEAs in September, within one month after finalizing DESE's verification of LEA calls. The final reports include noncompliance due to timelines and any other student file review findings. In summary, the findings issued in September are based on data from the immediately preceding school year. Therefore, the correction of noncompliance "identified" in FFY 2019 is based on data from FFY 2018 which was reported in the second prior APR.

In FFY 2019, there were 75 individual child level findings of noncompliance in 17 LEAs. The state's follow-up procedures require LEAs submit a second set of timeline data for children with initial evaluations. The state verified through this follow-up that all 17 LEAs demonstrated no further noncompliance within the OSEP required timeline of 12 months and were correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data.

Describe how the State verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected

In FFY 2019, there were 75 individual child level findings of noncompliance in 17 LEAs. The state's follow-up procedures require LEA submission of documentation that each individual case of noncompliance has been corrected. The state verified through this follow-up that all 17 LEAs with noncompliance had corrected all 75 findings of individual child noncompliance within 12 months and: (1) were correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data; and (2) had corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

11 - Prior FFY Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2019, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019, although its FFY 2019 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019.

Response to actions required in FFY 2019 SPP/APR

See descriptions above.

11 - OSEP Response**11 - Required Actions**

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2020, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020, although its FFY 2020 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020.

Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Compliance indicator: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Data Source

Data to be taken from State monitoring or State data system.

Measurement

- a. # of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.
- b. # of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to their third birthdays.
- c. # of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.
- d. # of children for whom parent refusal to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services or to whom exceptions under 34 CFR §300.301(d) applied.
- e. # of children determined to be eligible for early intervention services under Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.
- f. # of children whose parents chose to continue early intervention services beyond the child's third birthday through a State's policy under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option.

Account for children included in (a), but not included in b, c, d, e, or f. Indicate the range of days beyond the third birthday when eligibility was determined and the IEP developed, and the reasons for the delays.

Percent = [(c) divided by (a - b - d - e - f)] times 100.

Instructions

If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select LEAs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, include data for the entire reporting year.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Targets must be 100%.

Category f is to be used only by States that have an approved policy for providing parents the option of continuing early intervention services beyond the child's third birthday under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

12 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	95.40%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	97.51%	98.54%	98.33%	100.00%	100.00%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.	601
b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to third birthday.	93

c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	332
d. Number for whom parent refusals to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services or to whom exceptions under 34 CFR §300.301(d) applied.	3
e. Number of children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.	3
f. Number of children whose parents chose to continue early intervention services beyond the child's third birthday through a State's policy under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option.	159

Measure	Numerator (c)	Denominator (a-b-d-e-f)	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3 who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	332	343	100.00%	100%	96.79%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

The slippage from 100% to 96.8% is due to missed timelines for 11 children statewide. See below for explanation of the missed timelines.

Number of children who served in Part C and referred to Part B for eligibility determination that are not included in b, c, d, e, or f

11

Account for children included in (a), but not included in b, c, d, e, or f. Indicate the range of days beyond the third birthday when eligibility was determined and the IEP developed, and the reasons for the delays.

For the eleven children for whom the IEP was not developed and implemented by the third birthday, the delays ranged from three to 69 days. Eight of the children were referred from Part C to ECSE less than 90 days prior to the third birthday, causing the LEAs to believe that the third birthday requirement did not apply – they confused a late referral FROM Part C with a late referral TO Part C. Reasons for the longest delays included COVID-19 related delays in conducting evaluations.

Attach PDF table (optional)

What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?

State monitoring

Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data.

Data for this indicator are gathered in the web-based system, IMACS, which is used by LEAs to enter monitoring self-assessment information, including a list of children served in Part C and referred to Part B for eligibility determination. The special education monitoring cycle is part of a three-year cohort process, and approximately one-third of all LEAs are reviewed each year. Each of the three cohorts is representative of the state and includes LEAs in all regions of the state.

LEAs enter the following information for each child referred from Part C during the reporting period:

- Child's name
- Date of birth
- Date of referral to ECSE
- Date of referral to First Steps (Part C)
- Parental Consent Received (Y/N)
- Date of eligibility
- Student eligible? (Y/N)
- Date of IEP
- IEP in place by third birthday (calculated Y/N)
- If No, reason for delay
- Acceptable reason (Y/N)

The information is reviewed and verified by DESE compliance staff as a part of the desk review of the self-assessment data. The only acceptable reasons for exceeding the timeline are failure of parent to provide consent to evaluate in a timely manner or failure of the parent to make the child available for evaluation.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

COVID-19 Impact: Data collection for this indicator was not impacted by COVID-19.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
0			0

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

12 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

12 - OSEP Response

12 - Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2020, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020, although its FFY 2020 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020.

Indicator 13: Secondary Transition

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Compliance indicator: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs. There also must be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency that is likely to be responsible for providing or paying for transition services, including, if appropriate, pre-employment transition services, was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Data Source

Data to be taken from State monitoring or State data system.

Measurement

Percent = $\left(\frac{\text{[# of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs. There also must be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency that is likely to be responsible for providing or paying for transition services, including, if appropriate, pre-employment transition services, was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority]}{\text{[# of youth with an IEP age 16 and above]}} \right) \times 100$.

If a State's policies and procedures provide that public agencies must meet these requirements at an age younger than 16, the State may, but is not required to, choose to include youth beginning at that younger age in its data for this indicator. If a State chooses to do this, it must state this clearly in its SPP/APR and ensure that its baseline data are based on youth beginning at that younger age.

Instructions

If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select LEAs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, include data for the entire reporting year.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Targets must be 100%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

13 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2009	91.30%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	88.29%	87.67%	94.42%	93.62%	89.21%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth aged 16 and above with IEPs that contain each of the required components for secondary transition	Number of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
609	687	89.21%	100%	88.65%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?

State monitoring

Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data.

Data for this indicator are gathered in the web-based system, IMACS, which is used by LEAs to enter self-assessment information. Approximately one-third of all LEAs are reviewed each year for special education monitoring purposes.

LEAs complete a file review on transition age students and address the following statements for each student:

- 200.800.a: A measurable postsecondary goal (or goals) that covers education or training, employment, and, as needed, independent living.
- 200.800.b: Annual IEP goal(s) that will reasonably enable the child to meet the postsecondary goal(s).
- 200.800.c: Transition services in the IEP that focus on improving the academic and functional achievement of the child to facilitate their movement from school to post-school.
- 200.800.d: If appropriate, there is evidence that a representative of any participating agency was invited to the IEP team meeting with the proper consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority.
- 200.800.e: The measurable postsecondary goals are based on age-appropriate transition assessment.
- 200.800.f: The transition services include courses of study that focus on improving the academic and functional achievement of the child to facilitate their movement from school to post-school.
- 200.800.g: The transition services were developed considering the individual child's needs, preferences, and interests.
- 200.800.i: There is evidence the student was invited to the IEP team meeting where transition services were discussed.

OSE staff request documentation from LEAs to review and verify LEA calls based on the above standards. LEAs identified with noncompliance are required to address individual student noncompliance and complete corrective action plans that ensure correction of noncompliance within 12 months. Documentation of correction is submitted for review and verification.

Question	Yes / No
Do the State's policies and procedures provide that public agencies must meet these requirements at an age younger than 16?	NO

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

COVID-19 Impact: Data collection for this indicator was not impacted by COVID-19.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
35	35		0

FFY 2019 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

As described in the introduction, LEAs in the monitoring cohort conduct a self-assessment, including student file reviews, throughout the school year and submit the results to DESE in the spring. Data submitted by the LEAs are not considered noncompliant until verification by OSE staff has been completed. Throughout late spring and summer, OSE staff request any necessary documentation from the LEAs in order to verify LEA compliance calls.

Final reports are issued to LEAs in September, within one month after finalizing DESE's verification of LEA calls. The final reports include noncompliance due to timelines and any other student file review findings. In summary, the findings issued in September are based on data from the immediately preceding school year. Therefore, the correction of noncompliance "identified" in FFY 2019 is based on data from FFY 2018 which was reported in the second prior APR.

In FFY 2019, there were 35 individual child level findings of noncompliance in 28 LEAs. The state's follow-up procedures require LEA submission of a second set of IEP secondary transition plan data. The state verified through this follow-up that all 28 LEAs demonstrated no further noncompliance within the OSEP required timeline of 12 months and were correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data.

Describe how the State verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected

In FFY 2019, there were 35 individual child level findings of noncompliance in 28 LEAs. The state's follow-up procedures require LEA submission of documentation that each individual case of noncompliance has been corrected. The state verified through this follow-up that all 28 LEAs with noncompliance had corrected all 35 findings of individual child noncompliance within 12 months and: (1) were correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data; and (2) had corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

13 - Prior FFY Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2019, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, that it has verified that

each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019, although its FFY 2019 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019.

Response to actions required in FFY 2019 SPP/APR

See information above.

13 - OSEP Response

13 - Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2020, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020, although its FFY 2020 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020.

Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Results indicator: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were:

- A. Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.
- B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school.
- C. Enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Data Source

State selected data source.

Measurement

- A. Percent enrolled in higher education = $\left[\frac{\text{(\# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school)}}{\text{(\# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)}} \right] \times 100$.
- B. Percent enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school = $\left[\frac{\text{(\# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school)}}{\text{(\# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)}} \right] \times 100$.
- C. Percent enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment = $\left[\frac{\text{(\# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment)}}{\text{(\# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)}} \right] \times 100$.

Instructions

Sampling of youth who had IEPs and are no longer in secondary school is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates of the target population. (See [General Instructions](#) on page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)

Collect data by September 2021 on students who left school during 2019-2020, timing the data collection so that at least one year has passed since the students left school. Include students who dropped out during 2019-2020 or who were expected to return but did not return for the current school year. This includes all youth who had an IEP in effect at the time they left school, including those who graduated with a regular diploma or some other credential, dropped out, or aged out.

I. Definitions

Enrolled in higher education as used in measures A, B, and C means youth have been enrolled on a full- or part-time basis in a community college (two-year program) or college/university (four or more year program) for at least one complete term, at any time in the year since leaving high school.

Competitive employment as used in measures B and C: States have two options to report data under “competitive employment”:

Option 1: Use the same definition as used to report in the FFY 2015 SPP/APR, i.e., competitive employment means that youth have worked for pay at or above the minimum wage in a setting with others who are nondisabled for a period of 20 hours a week for at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This includes military employment.

Option 2: States report in alignment with the term “competitive integrated employment” and its definition, in section 7(5) of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended by Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA). For the purpose of defining the rate of compensation for students working on a “part-time basis” under this category, OSEP maintains the standard of 20 hours a week for at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This definition applies to military employment.

Enrolled in other postsecondary education or training as used in measure C, means youth have been enrolled on a full- or part-time basis for at least 1 complete term at any time in the year since leaving high school in an education or training program (e.g., Job Corps, adult education, workforce development program, vocational technical school which is less than a two-year program).

Some other employment as used in measure C means youth have worked for pay or been self-employed for a period of at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This includes working in a family business (e.g., farm, store, fishing, ranching, catering services, etc.).

II. Data Reporting

States must describe the metric used to determine representativeness (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group).

Provide the total number of targeted youth in the sample or census.

Provide the actual numbers for each of the following mutually exclusive categories. The actual number of “leavers” who are:

1. Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school;
2. Competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education);
3. Enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education or competitively employed);
4. In some other employment within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program, or competitively employed).

“Leavers” should only be counted in one of the above categories, and the categories are organized hierarchically. So, for example, “leavers” who are enrolled in full- or part-time higher education within one year of leaving high school should only be reported in category 1, even if they also

happen to be employed. Likewise, "leavers" who are not enrolled in either part- or full-time higher education, but who are competitively employed, should only be reported under category 2, even if they happen to be enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program.

States must compare the response rate for the reporting year to the response rate for the previous year (e.g., in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, compare the FFY 2020 response rate to the FFY 2019 response rate), and describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate year over year, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

The State must also analyze the response rate to identify potential nonresponse bias and take steps to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

III. Reporting on the Measures/Indicators

Targets must be established for measures A, B, and C.

Measure A: For purposes of reporting on the measures/indicators, please note that any youth enrolled in an institution of higher education (that meets any definition of this term in the Higher Education Act (HEA)) within one year of leaving high school must be reported under measure A. This could include youth who also happen to be competitively employed, or in some other training program; however, the key outcome we are interested in here is enrollment in higher education.

Measure B: All youth reported under measure A should also be reported under measure B, in addition to all youth that obtain competitive employment within one year of leaving high school.

Measure C: All youth reported under measures A and B should also be reported under measure C, in addition to youth that are enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program, or in some other employment.

Include the State's analyses of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school. States should consider categories such as race/ethnicity, disability category, and geographic location in the State.

If the analysis shows that the response data are not representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics. In identifying such strategies, the State should consider factors such as how the State collected the data.

Beginning with the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, due Feb. 1, 2023, when reporting the extent to which the demographics of respondents are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, States must include race/ethnicity in its analysis. In addition, the State's analysis must include at least one of the following demographics: disability category, gender, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process.

14 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Measure	Baseline	FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
A	2009	Target ≥	24.40%	24.40%	24.40%	24.40%	24.40%
A	23.38%	Data	29.55%	28.50%	25.52%	25.21%	24.60%
B	2009	Target ≥	46.90%	46.90%	46.90%	46.90%	46.90%
B	45.94%	Data	60.89%	59.67%	58.25%	57.93%	57.35%
C	2009	Target ≥	51.30%	51.30%	51.30%	51.30%	51.30%
C	50.33%	Data	65.90%	64.29%	62.90%	62.63%	61.59%

FFY 2020 Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A ≥	23.00%	23.40%	23.80%	24.20%	24.60%	25.00%
Target B ≥	55.00%	55.40%	55.80%	56.20%	56.60%	57.00%
Target C ≥	60.00%	60.40%	60.80%	61.20%	61.60%	62.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

In Missouri, the Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) serves dual roles as an advisory group to the OSE and as the primary stakeholder group for Part B compliance and services. The SEAP reviewed SPP/APR data at each of their quarterly meetings during 2021 and provided overarching recommendations on targets after reviewing the feedback received from all stakeholders on all SPP/APR indicators, including the SSIP. The SEAP was also instrumental in helping to shape the outreach efforts for broader parent input. See the Introduction for additional information on broad stakeholder engagement.

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

Total number of targeted youth in the sample or census	6,870
Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	6,870
Response Rate	100.00%
1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school	1,599
2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	2,247
3. Number of respondent youth enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education or competitively employed)	195
4. Number of respondent youth who are in some other employment within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program, or competitively employed).	95

Measure	Number of respondent youth	Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Enrolled in higher education (1)	1,599	6,870	24.60%	23.00%	23.28%	Met target	No Slippage
B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2)	3,846	6,870	57.35%	55.00%	55.98%	Met target	No Slippage
C. Enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment (1+2+3+4)	4,136	6,870	61.59%	60.00%	60.20%	Met target	No Slippage

Please select the reporting option your State is using:

Option 2: Report in alignment with the term "competitive integrated employment" and its definition, in section 7(5) of the Rehabilitation Act, as amended by Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA), and 34 CFR §361.5(c)(9). For the purpose of defining the rate of compensation for students working on a "part-time basis" under this category, OSEP maintains the standard of 20 hours a week for at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This definition applies to military employment.

Response Rate

FFY	2019	2020
Response Rate	100.00%	100.00%

Describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate year over year, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

Not applicable since Missouri uses a census data collection resulting in 100% response rate.

Describe the analysis of the response rate including any nonresponse bias that was identified, and the steps taken to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

Not applicable since Missouri uses a census data collection resulting in 100% response rate.

Include the State's analyses of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

Missouri differs from most, if not all, states in that the state receives follow-up status on the entire population of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had an IEP in effect at the time they left school.

LEAs are responsible for conducting the follow-up on former students and for reporting the data to the state. The state data collection mechanism requires that all LEAs report a follow-up status for each applicable youth. If an LEA is not able to locate former students in order to ascertain their status, the follow-up status reported is "unknown." "Unknown" responses are included in the number of respondent youth (denominator of the calculations), but not in sections A, B, or C.

Therefore, since the state uses this census data collection requiring that a follow-up status be reported by LEAs for all applicable youth, the data included in this APR are 100% representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

The response data is representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school. (yes/no)

YES

If no, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics.

Describe the metric used to determine representativeness (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group).

Not applicable since Missouri uses a census data collection resulting in 100% response rate.

Sampling Question	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO
Survey Question	Yes / No
Was a survey used?	NO

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

COVID-19 impact: Data collection for this indicator was not impacted by COVID-19.

14 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

14 - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

14 - Required Actions

Indicator 15: Resolution Sessions

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Results Indicator: Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements.
(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Data Source

Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey in the EDFacts Metadata and Process System (EMAPS)).

Measurement

Percent = (3.1(a) divided by 3.1) times 100.

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

States are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of resolution sessions is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of resolution sessions reaches 10 or greater, develop baseline and targets and report on them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

States may express their targets in a range (e.g., 75-85%).

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data under IDEA section 618, explain.

States are not required to report data at the LEA level.

15 - Indicator Data

Select yes to use target ranges

Target Range not used

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/03/2021	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	26
SY 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/03/2021	3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	6

Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.

NO

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

In Missouri, the Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) serves dual roles as an advisory group to the OSE and as the primary stakeholder group for Part B compliance and services. The SEAP reviewed SPP/APR data at each of their quarterly meetings during 2021 and provided overarching recommendations on targets after reviewing the feedback received from all stakeholders on all SPP/APR indicators, including the SSIP. The SEAP was also instrumental in helping to shape the outreach efforts for broader parent input. See the Introduction for additional information on broad stakeholder engagement.

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	46.90%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target >=	35.30%	35.30%	35.30%	35.30%	35.30%
Data	52.94%	58.97%	21.74%	60.00%	41.46%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=	36.00%	36.00%	36.00%	36.00%	36.00%	36.00%

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

3.1(a) Number resolutions sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolutions sessions	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
6	26	41.46%	36.00%	23.08%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

The state dropped below the target of 35.3% due, in part, to the low number of resolution meetings held (the state had only 38 due process complaints filed in 2020-21, and 26 of those had a resolution meeting). The low number of resolution meetings makes the resulting percentages for this indicator highly volatile. The state is not a party to the resolution meetings, and therefore has no ability to influence the outcomes of the resolution meetings. It is unknown why a lower percentage of resolution meetings resulted in written settlement agreements, however, it should be noted that large numbers of due process complaints are withdrawn or dismissed, and while the resolution meetings may not have resulted in written settlement agreements, the conversations may have contributed to the ultimate withdrawal of the complaint.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Data collection for this indicator was not impacted by COVID-19.

15 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

15 - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

15 - Required Actions

Indicator 16: Mediation

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Results indicator: Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3(B)))

Data Source

Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey in the EDFacts Metadata and Process System (EMAPS)).

Measurement

Percent = $(2.1(a)(i) + 2.1(b)(ii))$ divided by 2.1 times 100.

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

States are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of mediations is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of resolution mediations reaches 10 or greater, develop baseline and targets and report on them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

States may express their targets in a range (e.g., 75-85%).

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data under IDEA section 618, explain.

States are not required to report data at the LEA level.

16 - Indicator Data

Select yes to use target ranges

Target Range not used

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/03/2021	2.1 Mediations held	16
SY 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/03/2021	2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	1
SY 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/03/2021	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	11

Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.

NO

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

In Missouri, the Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) serves dual roles as an advisory group to the OSE and as the primary stakeholder group for Part B compliance and services. The SEAP reviewed SPP/APR data at each of their quarterly meetings during 2021 and provided overarching recommendations on targets after reviewing the feedback received from all stakeholders on all SPP/APR indicators, including the SSIP. The SEAP was also instrumental in helping to shape the outreach efforts for broader parent input. See the Introduction for additional information on broad stakeholder engagement.

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	66.70%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target >=	35.30%	35.30%	35.30%	35.30%	35.30%
Data	80.95%	66.67%	81.82%	64.71%	83.33%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=	36.00%	36.00%	36.00%	36.00%	36.00%	36.00%

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

2.1.a.i Mediation agreements related to due process complaints	2.1.b.i Mediation agreements not related to due process complaints	2.1 Number of mediations held	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
1	11	16	83.33%	36.00%	75.00%	Met target	No Slippage

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Data collection for this indicator was not impacted by COVID-19.

16 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

16 - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

16 - Required Actions

Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: General Supervision

The State's SPP/APR includes a State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) that meets the requirements set forth for this indicator.

Measurement

The State's SPP/APR includes an SSIP that is a comprehensive, ambitious, yet achievable multi-year plan for improving results for children with disabilities. The SSIP includes each of the components described below.

Instructions

Baseline Data: The State must provide baseline data that must be expressed as a percentage and which is aligned with the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities.

Targets: In its FFY 2020 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2022, the State must provide measurable and rigorous targets (expressed as percentages) for each of the six years from FFY 2020 through FFY 2025. The State's FFY 2025 target must demonstrate improvement over the State's baseline data.

Updated Data: In its FFYs 2020 through FFY 2025 SPPs/APRs, due February 2, 2022, the State must provide updated data for that specific FFY (expressed as percentages) and that data must be aligned with the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities. In its FFYs 2020 through FFY 2025 SPPs/APRs, the State must report on whether it met its target.

Overview of the Three Phases of the SSIP

It is of the utmost importance to improve results for children with disabilities by improving educational services, including special education and related services. Stakeholders, including parents of children with disabilities, local educational agencies, the State Advisory Panel, and others, are critical participants in improving results for children with disabilities and should be included in developing, implementing, evaluating, and revising the SSIP and included in establishing the State's targets under Indicator 17. The SSIP should include information about stakeholder involvement in all three phases.

Phase I: Analysis:

- Data Analysis;
- Analysis of State Infrastructure to Support Improvement and Build Capacity;
- State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities;
- Selection of Coherent Improvement Strategies; and
- Theory of Action.

Phase II: Plan (which, in addition to the Phase I content (including any updates) outlined above:

- Infrastructure Development;
- Support for local educational agency (LEA) Implementation of Evidence-Based Practices; and
- Evaluation.

Phase III: Implementation and Evaluation (which, in addition to the Phase I and Phase II content (including any updates) outlined above:

- Results of Ongoing Evaluation and Revisions to the SSIP.

Specific Content of Each Phase of the SSIP

Refer to FFY 2013-2015 Measurement Table for detailed requirements of Phase I and Phase II SSIP submissions.

Phase III should only include information from Phase I or Phase II if changes or revisions are being made by the State and/or if information previously required in Phase I or Phase II was not reported.

Phase III: Implementation and Evaluation

In Phase III, the State must, consistent with its evaluation plan described in Phase II, assess and report on its progress implementing the SSIP. This includes: (A) data and analysis on the extent to which the State has made progress toward and/or met the State-established short-term and long-term outcomes or objectives for implementation of the SSIP and its progress toward achieving the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities (SiMR); (B) the rationale for any revisions that were made, or that the State intends to make, to the SSIP as the result of implementation, analysis, and evaluation; and (C) a description of the meaningful stakeholder engagement. If the State intends to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications, the State must describe how the data from the evaluation support this decision.

A. Data Analysis

As required in the Instructions for the Indicator/Measurement, in its FFYs 2020 through 2025 SPP/APR, the State must report data for that specific FFY (expressed as actual numbers and percentages) that are aligned with the SiMR. The State must report on whether the State met its target. In addition, the State may report on any additional data (e.g., progress monitoring data) that were collected and analyzed that would suggest progress toward the SiMR. States using a subset of the population from the indicator (e.g., a sample, cohort model) should describe how data are collected and analyzed for the SiMR if that was not described in Phase I or Phase II of the SSIP.

B. Phase III Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation

The State must provide a narrative or graphic representation, e.g., a logic model, of the principal activities, measures and outcomes that were implemented since the State's last SSIP submission (i.e., Feb 2021). The evaluation should align with the theory of action described in Phase I and the evaluation plan described in Phase II. The State must describe any changes to the activities, strategies, or timelines described in Phase II and include a rationale or justification for the changes. If the State intends to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications, the State must describe how the data from the evaluation support this decision.

The State must summarize the infrastructure improvement strategies that were implemented, and the short-term outcomes achieved, including the measures or rationale used by the State and stakeholders to assess and communicate achievement. Relate short-term outcomes to one or more areas of a systems framework (e.g., governance, data, finance, accountability/monitoring, quality standards, professional development and/or technical assistance) and explain how these strategies support system change and are necessary for: (a) achievement of the SiMR; (b) sustainability of systems improvement efforts; and/or (c) scale-up. The State must describe the next steps for each infrastructure improvement strategy and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next fiscal year (e.g., for the FFY 2020 APR, report on anticipated outcomes to be obtained during FFY 2021, i.e., July 1, 2021-June 30, 2022).

The State must summarize the specific evidence-based practices that were implemented and the strategies or activities that supported their selection and ensured their use with fidelity. Describe how the evidence-based practices, and activities or strategies that support their use, are intended to impact the SiMR by changing program/district policies, procedures, and/or practices, teacher/provider practices (i.e., behaviors), parent/caregiver outcomes,

and/or child outcomes. Describe any additional data (i.e., progress monitoring data) that was collected to support the on-going use of the evidence-based practices and inform decision-making for the next year of SSIP implementation.

C. Stakeholder Engagement

The State must describe the specific strategies implemented to engage stakeholders in key improvement efforts and how the State addressed concerns, if any, raised by stakeholders through its engagement activities.

Additional Implementation Activities

The State should identify any activities not already described that it intends to implement in the next fiscal year (e.g., for the FFY 2020 APR, report on activities it intends to implement in FFY 2021, i.e., July 1, 2021-June 30, 2022) including a timeline, anticipated data collection and measures, and expected outcomes that are related to the SiMR. The State should describe any newly identified barriers and include steps to address these barriers.

17 - Indicator Data

Section A: Data Analysis

What is the State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR)?

Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards in grades three through eight and high school in English/language arts (ELA) in LEAs participating in District Continuous Improvement (DCI) work.

Has the SiMR changed since the last SSIP submission? (yes/no)

NO

Is the State using a subset of the population from the indicator (e.g., a sample, cohort model)? (yes/no)

YES

Provide a description of the subset of the population from the indicator.

Data are included from LEAs that are participating in the DCI work.

Is the State's theory of action new or revised since the previous submission? (yes/no)

YES

Please provide a description of the changes and updates to the theory of action.

The theory of action is updated to reflect the transition from Collaborative Work (CW) focused at the building level to the DCI process to develop and align highly effective educational practices at the LEA level.

Please provide a link to the current theory of action.

<https://dese.mo.gov/media/pdf/ssip-theory-action>

Does the State intend to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications? (yes/no)

YES

If yes, describe how evaluation data support the decision to implement without any modifications to the SSIP.

Evaluation data to support the decision to continue implementation of DCI work without any modifications include:

- District interactions between DCI Consultants and LEA staff during 2020-21 occurred in fewer DCI LEAs, but the number of interactions occurring within those DCI LEAs is much greater in number over previous years reflecting deeper implementation of practices which is a desired outcome.
- Data reveal the number of fully completed self-assessment practice profiles (SAPP) from July 1, 2020, to September 30, 2021, was slightly lower at 26,185 than the previous reporting period July 1, 2019, to June 30, 2020, (27,865). While this is a difference of 1,680, we still consider this a good outcome in the face of the continued effects of COVID-19 which have significantly challenged LEAs during 2020-21 as they try to focus and implement effective educational practices. This data demonstrates continued use of Virtual Learning Platform (VLP) tools for professional development to aid in growing educators' knowledge and skill level and changing adult behaviors of educators is being achieved.
- Consultant log data continue to confirm sustained coaching events over training events thereby achieving actual implementation and continued application of effective educational practices within DCI.
- State assessment data for 2020-21 indicated that LEAs in full implementation had a higher percent of IEP students who scored proficient or advanced (19.9%) than non-MMD LEAs (14.2%) and all MMD LEAs (15.5%). Similarly, the percent proficient or advanced for all students was higher in LEAs in full MMD implementation (48.9%) than in non-MMD LEAs (44.9%) and all MMD LEAs (47.0%).

Progress toward the SiMR

Please provide the data for the specific FFY listed below (expressed as actual number and percentages).

Select yes if the State uses two targets for measurement. (yes/no)

NO

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2017	19.30%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
-----	------	------	------	------	------	------

Target> =	15.50%	16.50%	17.50%	20.00%	21.00%	22.00%
--------------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

Children with IEPs in regular assessment who scored at or above proficient against grade level standards	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
1,462	9,432		15.50%	15.50%	Met target	N/A

Provide the data source for the FFY 2020 data.

Regular grade level and end of course state assessment data.

Note that FFY 2019 data are not available due to state assessment waivers for the 2019-20 school year due to COVID-19. Also note that while we have indicated that no changes were made to the SiMR, the statement has been updated to align with all other SPP Indicators in that the intermediate and final targets are reflected in the separate target table. The measurement of the SiMR remains the same.

Please describe how data are collected and analyzed for the SiMR.

State assessment proficiency data for LEAs engaged in the DCI work are compared to data for LEAs not engaged in DCI work as well as other groupings of LEAs. Proficiency rates for students with disabilities are also compared to results for nondisabled students.

Optional: Has the State collected additional data (i.e., benchmark, CQI, survey) that demonstrates progress toward the SiMR? (yes/no)

NO

Did the State identify any general data quality concerns, unrelated to COVID-19, that affected progress toward the SiMR during the reporting period? (yes/no)

NO

Did the State identify any data quality concerns directly related to the COVID-19 pandemic during the reporting period? (yes/no)

YES

If data for this reporting period were impacted specifically by COVID-19, the State must include in the narrative for the indicator: (1) the impact on data completeness, validity and reliability for the indicator; (2) an explanation of how COVID-19 specifically impacted the State's ability to collect the data for the indicator; and (3) any steps the State took to mitigate the impact of COVID-19 on the data collection.

While not considered a data quality concern, state assessment participation rates were lower than usual in 2020-21, however they remained above 95 percent. Proficiency rates for all students decreased from 2018-19 to 2020-21, presumably due to COVID-19 disruptions in education.

Section B: Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation

Please provide a link to the State's current evaluation plan.

<https://dese.mo.gov/media/pdf/ssip-evaluation-plan>

Is the State's evaluation plan new or revised since the previous submission? (yes/no)

NO

Provide a summary of each infrastructure improvement strategy implemented in the reporting period:

Continued infrastructure strategies include:

1) Virtual Learning Platform (VLP) contains content aligned into pillars with continued promotion as DESE's online system for Missouri educator professional development. The VLP houses and maintains the tools and resources to support Missouri district continuous improvement efforts. The VLP web application is only available to Missouri educators. Included on the VLP are professional learning modules (PLM) (including pre/post assessments, handouts, worksheets/planning templates), a data dashboard that tracks a user's progress through their corresponding PLMs, space for user collaboration, and bookmarking of course(s) in progress. Materials in the VLP are organized to provide maximum flexibility of access for all users, from totally self-directed to highly directed and structured. While the type of user may vary, all users have access to all course materials and corresponding data dashboards. The data dashboard for administrators allows additional capabilities including the ability to assign and monitor coursework, access to a district needs assessment, and view building and district-wide professional development progress.

A guest pass link allows access into the PLMs and self-assessment practice profiles (SAPP) (<https://deseapps.leaderservices.com/VLP/app/index.aspx>), but without access to the data dashboard. These materials are also available on <https://www.moedu-sail.org/mtss-facilitator-materials/> for public access.

2) Expansion of professional learning modules and associated tools added to VLP include LEA-level leadership, collective teacher efficacy, and behavioral modules from Missouri's Schoolwide Positive Behavior Supports (MO SW-PBS) initiative. Existing support materials for all professional learning modules are updated and revised regularly to maintain high quality.

3) DCI Coaching Support Team (CST) meetings held monthly to articulate vision, direction, and need of the DCI process to regional field staff. Meeting content emphasizes the use of virtual communication for meetings, trainings, and coaching sessions; VLP enhancements; strategies for shared collaboration when appropriate; data collection/analysis; a continued shift away from reliance on training only model to a model that emphasizes coaching; and technical assistance regarding highly effective educational practices.

4) Cross-regional work by field staff within the Implementation Zone framework (Early, Developing, Initial, Full) <https://www.moedu-sail.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/11/Implementation-Zones-Guide-2nd-ed.-2021.pdf> using virtual and face-to-face training, coaching, and technical assistance focused on academic and behavioral DESE vetted materials.

5) Consultant log (DESE and DCI) data in specific categories is entered monthly by regional field staff into two electronic data systems. This information is compiled, reviewed, and analyzed regularly by OSE staff and the State Professional Development Grant (SPDG) Management Team to ensure regional staff are engaged in DCI related activities and show the progression of implementation in participating DCI LEAs. The data continue to reflect expected areas of focus (Data-based Decision Making (DBDM), Developing Assessment Capable Learners (DACL), and Common Formative Assessments (CFA)).

6) Consolidated contract that provides annual contractual requirements related to roles and responsibilities for regional technical assistance field staff (DCI consultants) was completed in June 2021.

Describe the short-term or intermediate outcomes achieved for each infrastructure improvement strategy during the reporting period including the measures or rationale used by the State and stakeholders to assess and communicate achievement. Please relate short-term outcomes to one or more areas of a systems framework (e.g., governance, data, finance, accountability/monitoring, quality standards, professional development and/or technical assistance) and explain how these strategies support system change and are necessary for: (a) achievement of the SiMR; (b) sustainability of systems improvement efforts; and/or (c) scale-up.

Corresponding outcomes:

1) VLP provides unified, consistent, and transparent materials, tools, and resources allowing LEAs to build internal capacity for improvement by increasing knowledge and skills, regardless of administrator and teacher mobility. LEAs provide their own professional development and maintain data collection tools for monitoring progress and fidelity of implementation of effective educational practices. LEAs may choose to provide their own training and/or coaching or access regional staff for assistance. The VLP provides for 24/7 access to professional development materials that may be used in a variety of ways. Users may range from an individual learner to a group or learners who may or may not be guided by a leader or facilitator. A district/building may decide to learn and implement the content without outside support or organize learning cohorts using an internal facilitator. For districts/schools desiring more support, a CST is available through Missouri's regional technical assistance network.

2) High quality, high effect size materials and tools continue to be developed and posted on the VLP for LEA use to build internal capacity for continuous improvement aligned to the five DESE pillars, and maintain high quality of all supporting materials and tools on the VLP. DESE provides Missouri educators with 24/7 access to educational practices that have a strong empirical evidence base and tools for LEAs to implement these practices with fidelity, monitor, and provide options for additional training and/or coaching if desired to create a strong statewide system of support for continuous improvement.

3) Field staff are kept informed about VLP enhancements, collaboratively share success and challenge data which DESE uses to adjust practice and improve materials and tools. This communication loop allows all field staff to be informed of current work and increase the skill level of all staff.

4) Consultants continue to collaborate and share expertise across RPDC regions rather than being siloed in their RPDC resulting in the removal of previous silos, growth of skills and knowledge for all, and fostering collective efficacy across the statewide system of support (SSOS).

5) DESE and DCI consultant log data continue to show regional staff doing 692 (31%) training-only events when compared with 1,522 (68%) coaching events. Missouri is pleased to report data show regional field staff are maintaining the shift away from a reliance on training only or partial use of coaching skills to a discernable increase in coaching events. Research tells us that a "training only" approach does not yield a change in adult behavior/practice; rather, training plus coaching support leads to the desired change.

6) The consolidated contract, which defines the legal requirement of technical assistance field staff, ensures the DCI work is implemented by qualified field staff who regularly participate in training events to collaborate and learn with other DCI colleagues to further skill and knowledge and implement this work with fidelity.

Did the State implement any new (newly identified) infrastructure improvement strategies during the reporting period? (yes/no)

YES

Describe each new (newly identified) infrastructure improvement strategy and the short-term or intermediate outcomes achieved.

New strategies:

1) VLP access opened to all Missouri educators beginning August 2021. Access was limited to DCI LEAs only to this point as the system was under initial development.

2) VLP enhancements include the District Needs Assessment which is a tool to assist LEAs in collectively self-assessing performance in key components of universal level practices (leadership, collaborative culture, effective teaching/learning practices, and data-based decision making).

3) Existing resources and materials on the VLP are revised, edited, and updated to reflect current and accurate content.

4) The High Quality Professional Development (HQPDC) observation form is refined and in use for training/coaching of CST staff.

5) Consolidated contract specifying contractual requirements for Special Education Improvement Consultants now includes the DACL CST professional learning module.

Corresponding outcomes:

1) Statewide access to highly effective, universal level materials, tools, and resources allows DESE to promote and provide consistent, high quality, LEA-level professional development products to all Missouri educators for use 24/7 by individuals through large groups of learners. LEAs may use the professional development materials and tools to build internal capacity for improvement or combine with support provided by regional field staff.

2) Inclusion of the District Needs Assessment encourages a systematic, LEA improvement process allowing Missouri educators to self-assess across

universal level areas of practice and prioritize improvement needs.

3) Materials, tools, and resources on the VLP reflect the most current research and up-to-date educational practices so Missouri educators and regional field staff have 24/7 access to high quality content for professional development provided in multiple formats to accommodate a range of learners (individual to large group).

4) Refinement of the HQPD observation form for training and coaching improves the quality of training and coaching provided to DCI LEAs by CST field staff through clarification of training/coaching expectations to serve as a basis for observation and feedback.

5) Inclusion of the DACL professional learning module expands the knowledge base of additional regional field staff (Special Education Improvement Consultants) involved in improvement work. This emphasizes teaching and learning practices with a high effect size to all educators, including special educators, across the state.

Provide a summary of the next steps for each infrastructure improvement strategy and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next reporting period.

Continued refinement of materials, tools, and resources on the VLP through revision, editing, and updating to maintain the high quality and accuracy of content. VLP content is promoted as DESE's improvement system of professional development and tools for LEA level use further demonstrating collaboration and unified promotion of essential LEA-level improvement work across DESE. The outcome for this strategy is to continue building a system of professional, high quality supports that enables LEAs to access and/or provide materials and tools to develop a multi-tiered system of support (MTSS).

Plans for integration of academic and behavior domains with the VLP to develop materials, tools, and resources to assist LEAs with development of multi-tiered systems of support recently began. A state level DCI MTSS for Academics and Behavior workgroup has started with plans to meet monthly to develop this new system. The outcome for this strategy is to continue MTSS development that includes evidence-based tiered practices across integrated academic and behavioral domains with integrated tools and supporting resources for LEA use.

Further expansion of VLP content includes new professional learning modules and tools around K-12 literacy modules. One set of professional learning modules promotes structured literacy instructional practices based in the cognitive science about how children learn to read. A second set of professional learning modules includes evidence-based instructional practice around adolescent literacy. The third set of literacy modules describes how to implement science of reading based instruction within DCI structures and processes. The outcome for this strategy is to reach beyond foundational, content neutral, universal level tiered system of support practices by integrating behavioral work into an MTSS structure and including universal level literacy instructional practices showing how to use DCI structures and processes to implement that work. DESE considers these areas the next step in advancing guidance and professional development materials and tools in order to achieve increased academic and behavioral outcomes for students.

While a long standing goal, it is challenging to change ingrained adult behaviors. In the past, regional staff were apprehensive about using technology for training/coaching purposes. COVID-19 pushed regional staff to change their behavior to respond to LEA needs which aligned with DESE's goal to use technology for job efficiency. Regional staff now provide an increased number of virtual training, coaching, and technical assistance events which we anticipate will continue to improve. The outcome for this strategy is to continue increasing the efficiency with which regional staff are able to work including the ability to communicate with more people in a shorter amount of time, decrease travel and operation costs, and work cross-regionally in the field and break down previous silos.

Data from consultant logs show regional staff continue to increase coaching skills over training. Outcomes for the strategies described above include 1) continued promotion of LEA-level improvement professional learning tools enabling LEAs to provide professional development and organize LEA-level improvement efforts in a systematic and comprehensive manner, 2) continued DCI alignment with DESE strategic plan and the SSOS, 3) continued growth of knowledge and skills for all Missouri educators at all levels of the statewide system.

List the selected evidence-based practices implement in the reporting period:

Evidence-based practices identified by Dr. John Hattie and the National Center for Educational Outcomes (NCEO) as having the highest effect sizes shown to result in exceptional student outcomes, including outcomes for students with disabilities, are included in the DCI work. The practices are cross-cutting so they will work for any subject/age/grade/content area and are effective for all students, including students with disabilities. Generally speaking, all teachers (including general education, special education, and special subject area teachers) are trained to (1) work on teams which focus on helping each other (collaborative team structures) to (2) use effective teaching/learning practices in all classrooms, (3) administer common formative assessments to provide data related to the effects of the teaching/learning experience, and (4) use data collectively to discuss and make decisions about next steps. Leadership guidance and support for LEA and building level practices and instructional leadership practices across the LEA and in each building are crucial to promoting and sustaining implementation of the evidence-based practices.

The DCI framework is a cohesive, interactive system resulting in exceptional outcomes for all Missouri students. The framework is comprised of 1) Content (DCI practices and supporting materials), 2) Professional Development (coaching, training, and online learning), and 3) Statewide System of Support (DESE, regional field staff, and other SPDG implementation partners).

The DCI practices and supporting materials include the following:

- Foundations: Three foundational educational practices essential for collaborative, data-informed instruction and decision making, including Collaborative Teams, DBDM, and CFA
- Effective Teaching and Learning: Practices selected in improving student achievement include DACL, Metacognition, Reciprocal Teaching, and Student Practice: Spaced vs. Massed
- Supportive Context: Practices that create a supportive context, sustaining and advancing effective teaching and learning, including School-Based Implementation Coaching (SBIC), and Collective Teacher Efficacy (CTE).

Provide a summary of each evidence-based practices.

Below is a summary of each evidence-based practice in the DCI framework.

Foundations

- Collaborative Teams: Effective and intentional collaboration about the most effective practices within curriculum, instruction, assessment, and climate allows for quality teaching to occur. Quality teaching is further enhanced when educators build collaborative processes into their system which allows for dialogue, discussion, and planning for all students.

- DBDM: LEA and building leadership teams should use a consistent DBDM process to identify and address student, school, and LEA improvement needs. Similarly, small groups of teachers should use a consistent DBDM process to identify students' academic and social/behavioral needs and select practices that address those needs. The Gather, Analyze, Intentionally Act, and Analyze Again (GAINS) process is designed to be compatible with various DBDM models that are being used in educational settings emphasizing how instruction impacts learning.

- CFA: Formative assessment provides ongoing information that can guide and improve teaching and learning during a learning cycle such as a lesson, unit or course. It may include collaboratively developed instruments as well as formative assessment strategies that are embedded in instruction rather than administered as separate events. Educators use CFAs within an LEA or building to ensure teacher and student performance is positive and consistent across grade levels and departments.

Effective Teaching and Learning Practices

- DACL: According to Dr. John Hattie, students who are assessment capable know where they are going, where they are now, and how to get there. These students know their current level of understanding, know the expectations for learning and are confident they can learn them, can select effective learning strategies, and view their own errors as opportunities to learn and seek feedback regarding their efforts.

- Metacognition: Metacognition occurs when students are cognizant of their thinking and level of cognition while in the process of learning. Metacognitive learners develop mental maps or pictures as a way of connecting ideas and concepts. Along with feedback, metacognitive practices align with DACL through talking about thinking and learning in general and specifically talking about one's own thinking and learning as well as providing opportunities for students to assess current thinking and learning.

- Reciprocal Teaching: Reciprocal teaching is an effective teaching/learning practice and is defined as students summarizing, questioning, clarifying, and predicting; they take turns being the teacher.

- Student Practice: Spaced vs. Massed: Research shows the same amount of information is remembered better if study practice sessions are spaced in time rather than done at one time. To successfully implement spaced study, teachers choose and structure practice sessions for information connection that strengthens understanding and retention.

Supportive Context

- SBIC: SBIC is critical to supporting the development of effective teaching and learning practices as educators may receive exposure or training on a new, highly effective practice but may not be able to implement this practice without effective feedback and coaching provided through SBIC. Coaches can help model effective implementation, provide feedback to guide implementation, and problem-solve barriers to implementation.

- CTE: In Dr. John Hattie's research, CTE is the influence ranked as having the highest effect size for impacting student achievement. CTE is a shared belief among teachers in a school that together their efforts will have a positive effect on student learning. DCI work fosters this mindset by providing opportunities for teachers to experience the four sources of efficacy, opportunities for teacher collaboration, designing school structures, and professional development that values teacher voice in decision making.

- Leadership: Educational leadership creates an LEA-wide culture committed to continuous improvement whereby staff are able to assess their impact, analyze options, and make adjustments. Effective leaders develop, align, and monitor system-wide plans for implementation focusing on impact within a cycle of continuous improvement that is data informed and occurs within a collaborative culture. These leaders empower educators at all levels to active engagement in continuous improvement and collective responsibility for student growth.

Provide a summary of how each evidence-based practice and activities or strategies that support its use, is intended to impact the SiMR by changing program/district policies, procedures, and/or practices, teacher/provider practices (e.g. behaviors), parent/caregiver outcomes, and/or child /outcomes.

Evidence-based practices identified by Dr. John Hattie and the NCEO as having the highest effect sizes shown to result in exceptional student outcomes, including outcomes for students with disabilities, through large scale, empirically-based research studies are included in all components of the DCI work. All DCI professional learning modules and supporting tools and resources developed to date around these topics are available 24/7 on the VLP for DCI LEAs and all Missouri educators.

By implementing practices within the DCI framework, the following outcomes are achieved:

- A cohesive system of support is developed that can be used statewide in any LEA, regardless of demographics
- Collaboration is fostered across statewide systems and resources are provided that support effective education for all Missouri students
- Data is collected to inform the DCI framework as a model for effective teaching/learning, identifying the non-negotiables (what works), and areas of flexibility when implementing in various contexts
- Implementation of effective educational practices result in exceptional outcomes for all students, especially students showing risk factors, including students with disabilities

The work of the State Implementation and Scaling-up of Evidence-based Practices Center (SISEP) identified considerations for and qualities of effective systems change. The Implementation Stages, as defined by SISEP, help us to understand what effective implementation looks like and how to get there, and Implementation Zones answer "where are we now." Based upon the work of SISEP, DCI LEAs are assigned to cadres that are then assigned to a DCI/CST facilitator. The cadres are organized across Implementation Zones to provide for differentiated field support, improve efficiency of regional staff to work across regional boundaries in both face-to-face and virtual formats and, to improve continuity of support from year-to-year ultimately aiding in sustainability of DCI Implementation Zones, a data-driven approach to describe LEA and building level implementation processes and outcomes.

Describe the data collected to monitor fidelity of implementation and to assess practice change.

Quantitative and qualitative data are collected to measure both implementation and impact on a wide range of variables at the state, regional, LEA, building, and classroom levels. To ensure fidelity of implementation of the DCI framework and support statewide scale-up and sustainability, a continuum of support through regional field staff, e-learning systems that include standardized professional learning modules and associated tools and resources, digital applications, and on-demand progress data are built into the resources and tools on the VLP.

The DCI project included 157 LEAs at the start of the 2020-21 year finishing the year with 123 as of August 30, 2021. Challenges related to COVID-19 including certificated teacher shortages, number of available substitutes, teacher and student mental health issues, increasing student behavior issues,

and scheduling difficulties affected the ability of some LEAs to change the focus of their efforts resulting in 34 LEAs leaving the project last year.

VLP: The VLP is DESE's online portal that provides access to DCI Professional Learning Modules and data tools (Collaborative Work Implementation Survey (CWIS), SAPPs, etc.). In addition to in-person or virtual coachings and trainings, DCI districts have 24/7 access to the DESE endorsed, evidence-based DCI materials. The VLP is available to teachers and school administrators through DESE's Web Application Portal and includes space for user collaboration, pre/post assessments, handouts, worksheets, bookmarking of courses in progress, and other materials needed to access and provide their own professional development and data collection tools for monitoring progress and fidelity of implementation of effective educational practices. State level data on VLP usage is reviewed regularly and show a continued increase in access to these materials and tools.

SAPP: Within the VLP, the Self-Assessment Practice Profile (SAPP) tool is used to outline implementation criteria using a rubric structure with clearly defined practice-level characteristics. The SAPP for self-monitoring implementation is important because it serves as a reminder of the implementation criteria and is aligned with the fidelity checklists. Fidelity checklists are short, focused checklists targeting specific implementation steps. All participating DCI LEAs regularly complete the SAPP in LEA-chosen priority areas at least two times a year. They are used to monitor implementation of the practices and are often used in teacher growth plans. Data reveal the number of fully completed SAPPs from July 1, 2020, to September 30, 2021, slightly lower at 26,185 over the previous reporting period July 1, 2019, to June 30, 2020, (27,865). Effects of COVID-19 continued to challenge LEAs during 2020-21 as they tried to focus on improvement efforts.

DESE Consultant Log System: Data in specific categories entered monthly by regional staff into an electronic DESE consultant log data system is compiled, reviewed, and analyzed regularly by OSE staff to ensure engagement of regional staff and show progression of implementation in DCI LEAs. Missouri is pleased to report that data continue to reflect that CST interactions show emphasis in expected areas of focus with twice as many coaching over training events this reporting period. Training events with DCI LEAs total 692 (31%) with coaching events at 1,522 (69%) for a total of 2,214 LEA interactions. The most common topics for training include DACL, CFA, and DBDM. The most common topics for coaching include the same areas along with leadership.

DCI Log System: DCI/CST data is also collected through logs maintained by the DCI facilitators outside the DESE consultant log system that includes LEA interactions (training, coaching, and planning with district leadership team meetings) based on attendance, duration, topics covered, evidence collected or viewed, and resources used. This information is compiled, reviewed, and analyzed regularly by the SPDG management team and OSE staff to understand types and frequency of engagement using the district-based model to inform capacity issues related to scaling and sustaining practice. CST/district interaction data showed a total of 2,145 coaching support team interactions, with an average of 13.66 interactions per LEA for the time span of July 1, 2020, through September 1, 2021.

As anticipated, September (208) and October (245) had the most interactions in the first semester as the school year was getting started and LEAs were planning for their year. In the second semester, January (264) and February (219) also similarly had the most interactions as the semester was getting off to a strong start. While the number of interactions was less, the average number of LEA interactions was much greater in 2020-21 (13.66) than in 2019-20 (2). These numbers paint the picture of a high level of engagement within a focused set of LEAs.

2021 CWIS: Spring and Fall submissions

The CWIS is required annually of all DCI participating LEAs and was developed through a collaborative process across five domains: 1) effective teaching and learning (ETLP), 2) CFA, 3) DBDM, 4) leadership (LEAD), and 5) professional development (PD). The survey has been tested extensively and its scales have proven internally valid and reliable.

Participation on the CWIS during 2021 continues to be impacted by COVID-19 (15,228 total responses). At least one educator or administrator in 533 buildings in 152 LEAs participated in the survey. A total of 489 buildings provided enough data to be included in analysis, with the requirement of five participants per building. These buildings were located in 136 LEAs, and the data from these LEAs were included in the analyses below. Of these, 42 were participating in the project for a fourth or fifth year (experienced).

Regarding implementation within the ETLP domain, the average educator reported half the time and most of the time. An average score of 3.6 was reported across 136 LEAs mentioned above, while those in experienced LEAs reported an average score of 3.8. A score of 4.0 is equal to a report of a key practice occurring "most of the time." Scores in other domains were higher, averaging between 4.2 for CFA, and 3.8 for PD (along with 4.1 for LEAD and 3.9 for DBDM). Scores in these domains followed similar trends to those seen in ETLP, with the largest difference in implementation scores between experienced and newer LEAs being in DBDM. The differences in the implementation scores reported by these experienced LEAs were significantly higher than the newer LEAs ($p < 0.01$) across all five domains. The values reported for DBDM also showed the most variation, which the data shared below may begin to explain.

Regarding participation as a member of a data team within their building, 62% of educators in the average LEA said that they were a member of such a team. Notably, 67% of educators in the average experienced LEA acknowledged data team participation. This difference in favor of experienced LEAs was significant ($p < 0.05$). Most LEAs reported in the 65% to 80% range with a few reporting between 30% and 55% of their educators engaged on teams which is spread evenly throughout that segment of the distribution. This is evidence that there is a subset of administrators that have started but are still working to get teams established across all buildings within their LEA.

Describe any additional data (e.g. progress monitoring) that was collected that supports the decision to continue the ongoing use of each evidence-based practice.

All collected data is described above.

Provide a summary of the next steps for each evidence-based practices and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next reporting period.

Moving forward, the DCI work will continue with no modifications to the existing structure, organization, or content as evaluation data show we are moving in the right direction regarding desired outcomes previously stated in this document.

Section C: Stakeholder Engagement

Description of Stakeholder Input

In Missouri, the Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) serves dual roles as an advisory group to the OSE and as the primary stakeholder group for Part B compliance and services. The SEAP reviewed SPP/APR data at each of their quarterly meetings during 2021 and provided overarching

recommendations on targets after reviewing the feedback received from all stakeholders on all SPP/APR indicators, including the SSIP. The SEAP was also instrumental in helping to shape the outreach efforts for broader parent input. See the Introduction for additional information on broad stakeholder engagement.

At the final SEAP meeting of the year that included SPP targets and a discussion of Indicator 17, panel members indicated a strong desire to provide guidance and encouragement to DESE to expand the marketing efforts related to the DCI and VLP process. They considered the VLP and the DCI process valuable state assets and supports that LEAs needed to be aware of and participate in to improve student outcomes. We anticipate marketing will be one of their major areas of focus as we move forward.

Describe the specific strategies implemented to engage stakeholders in key improvement efforts.

Missouri stakeholder groups related to DCI work include the SEAP, DESE's Division of Learning Services Leadership Team (Deputy Commissioner and all Assistant Commissioners), SPDG Management Team, RPDC Directors, DCI Consultants, DCI District Contacts, Area Supervisors, and MPACT. All stakeholder groups are given multiple opportunities to provide input and direction to implementation and evaluation of the initiative. These stakeholders bring a wide variety of expertise and experience to the conversation.

The SEAP reviews data, discusses, and provides advice on what is not clear and provides future recommendations about the state's plan for LEA-wide improvement efforts and the DCI model. The DESE Division of Learning Services Leadership Team provides direction for scaling the process and aligning with DESE's strategic plan and ESSA plan. They are responsible for decisions regarding evaluation design and implementation direction. The SPDG management team regularly reviews input from the stakeholder groups and project data to provide direction and develop resources for sustainability, scalability, and use of technology for efficiency and effectiveness. Monthly meetings of RPDC directors and DCI consultants offer numerous opportunities to discuss and offer feedback regarding the data collection, evaluation activities, data to inform about challenges and benefits of cross regional teams, and progress toward meeting goals. RPDC directors and area supervisors offer feedback on the LEA-wide model with recommendations for scaling coaching support teams and changing how regional staff spend their time. Cadre group meetings provide a depth of information relative to barriers LEAs face and how they move toward solutions. LEAs are given the opportunity to provide feedback on DCI tools. MPACT works in conjunction with DESE to develop and distribute parent resources and contribute data to inform about challenges and benefits related to these resources.

No major decisions or activities have taken place regarding implementation, modifications, or evaluation of the SSIP without significant stakeholder input. All stakeholders are provided with the needed materials and background information to provide informed feedback. We rely on contributions from all stakeholder groups to the Plan-Do-Study-Act process and any revisions made to the SSIP.

Discussions with all stakeholder groups has proven beneficial in increasing support in the use of evidence-based educational practices and positions the SSIP as a key contributor to the state's blueprint for success. Multiple opportunities for collaboration with other offices within DESE ensures that this work contributes to DESE's strategic plan.

In addition to the stakeholder work described above, SSIP information and a feedback survey was available to the public on the SPP stakeholder information webpage. See the Introduction for more information on SPP/APR stakeholder engagement.

Were there any concerns expressed by stakeholders during engagement activities? (yes/no)

YES

Describe how the State addressed the concerns expressed by stakeholders.

The SEAP previously expressed concern regarding expansion to new LEAs and ensuring regional capacity exists to support the work so as not to overwhelm the system. DESE addressed the purposes of cadre restructuring and discussed with the group whether the structure met those purposes. The discussion included consideration regarding what it takes to expand statewide and how technology is used to understand and respond to LEA needs. DESE's response includes 1) restructuring of cadres into Implementation Zones 2) regional field staff working cross-regionally to build capacity, 3) online platform for 24/7 access to "on demand" professional development for ALL educators, 4) flexible materials on VLP for in person or virtual training and coaching (individual through LEA learners), 5) consistent messaging, content, and supporting materials—same materials for LEAs and regional field staff, and 6) allowing LEAs to focus on a few practices to do well. DESE's response was revisited in the December 2021 SEAP meeting with no further concern expressed. When discussing future plans, a comment was noted about the need to market the VLP and associated materials and resources to all LEAs. DESE agrees with this comment and intends to make recommendations regarding this need.

The selection process used to assign DCI consultants to cadres that provide training, coaching, and technical assistance was a previous concern by the groups most directly involved with day-to-day DCI work (RPDC and DCI consultants). To address this concern, DESE and the SPDG Management Team again surveyed the DCI consultants and RPDC directors requesting input regarding consultant strengths about training, coaching, and technical assistance across Implementation Zones. In all cases, consultants were placed in their area of preference. This action continues to successfully address this issue.

A previous area of concern expressed by RPDC directors, DCI consultants, and area supervisors (statewide system of support) is cadre restructuring and LEA assignment to cadres within the new Implementation Zone structure. Concerns included 1) LEAs forming new relationships with regional staff after they had established relationships in the previous year and 2) future implications as LEAs move through the Implementation Zone structure and whether this would end some longstanding LEA/RPDC relationships resulting in disconnection with the region where the LEA is located. DESE responded by examining the purpose of the Implementation Zone structure through discussion of the LEA placement process with various members of the statewide system of support which is based on LEA engagement and implementation data and not random placement. The Implementation Zone structure is the most efficient way to organize field staff and meet the needs of LEAs in similar stages of implementation. Through many conversations with field staff and involvement in decision making about staff placement in cadres with members of the statewide system of support, DESE has increased their support for the DCI content and understanding of the operating organizational framework.

Additional Implementation Activities

List any activities not already described that the State intends to implement in the next fiscal year that are related to the SiMR.

None

Provide a timeline, anticipated data collection and measures, and expected outcomes for these activities that are related to the SiMR.

Not applicable

Describe any newly identified barriers and include steps to address these barriers.

Not applicable

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional).

17 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

17 - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

17 - Required Actions

Certification

Instructions

Choose the appropriate selection and complete all the certification information fields. Then click the "Submit" button to submit your APR.

Certify

I certify that I am the Chief State School Officer of the State, or his or her designee, and that the State's submission of its IDEA Part B State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report is accurate.

Select the certifier's role:

Designated by the Chief State School Officer to certify

Name and title of the individual certifying the accuracy of the State's submission of its IDEA Part B State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report.

Name:

Bob Bedell

Title:

Interim Assistant Commissioner

Email:

bob.bedell@dese.mo.gov

Phone:

573-751-5739

Submitted on:

04/28/22 11:10:37 AM